

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXVII.

BALTIMORE, FEBRUARY, 1912.

No. 2.

THE SECOND MAID'S TRAGEDY

There is in the British Museum a manuscript tragedy (Lansdowne ms. 807) of so much interest to scholars that for over two centuries it has provoked discussions and conjectures from experts, and others. Aside from the dramatic interest attaching to this curious piece—and this is by no means small—there is the interest in the manuscript itself (a model of beautiful Elizabethan handwriting, in perfect preservation, one of the few manuscripts which escaped Warburton's immortally notorious cook); there is the question of authorship, which has brought out more than one wild guess; and, finally, and not of least interest, is the question of the numerous alterations, corrections, deletions, and additions made in the original. This last point is of peculiar interest because it involves the question of the nature of the censorship of the drama at the close of the Elizabethan period; for the manuscript contains the corrections of Sir George Buc, then Master of the Revels, the first preserved instance we have of the kind in Buc's own hand.

The drama referred to has always gone by the title *The Second Maid's Tragedy*, for reasons which will appear. Langbaine evidently knew nothing of this manuscript, but Oldys wrote in his copy of the 1691 edition of Langbaine, opposite *The Maid's Tragedy*, the following note: "*The second Maid's Tragedy* licensed by Sr George Buc 31 Oct. 1611.—Tis a M. S. Folio in the possession of John Warburton Esq Somerset Herald.—Somebody has written upon it 'a Tragedy indeed!' It had no Authors name to it when Sr Geo. licensed it, but was afterwards ascribed to Geo. Chapman whose name by another hand is erased & Shakespeare's inserted." On the last page of the manuscript itself is the following, in Buc's handwriting: "This second Maydens tragedy (for it hath no

name inscribed) may with the reformations be acted publikely. 31. octob. 1611. G. Buc." This is the first licensed play in England of which we have the original manuscript and license. This method of endorsing the play on the back was followed by Buc's successor Sir Henry Herbert, and, in general, has been continued down to the present day. Below this interesting document, in a late 17th or early 18th century hand, is written, "By Thomas Goffe [or Goughe]," which has been marked out and "George Chapman" substituted, which in turn has been crossed out and replaced by "By Will Shakspear," followed by "A Tragedy indeed." Since these ascriptions, this tragedy has been placed to the credit of Massinger (by Tieck), of Cyril Tourneur (by Fleay), and of Middleton (by Swinburne).¹ It was not until 1824 that *The Second Maid's Tragedy* found its way into print. In that year it appeared in the *Old English Drama*, Vol. I, but with so many errors as to limit its value for textual study. In 1829 Tieck printed the piece in Vol. II of the *Shakespeare Vorschule*, and pointed out a number of blunders made in the English edition. In an able *Vorrede* Tieck makes out a strong case for Massinger as author of the tragedy, and, likewise, presents a plausible argument for naming the piece *The Tyrant* instead of by the title given it by Buc who, of course, had the then recent *Maid's Tragedy* in mind, the two dramas resembling in the one respect. On the first page of the manuscript, in the list of *dramatis personae*, the leading character is called "the now Usurping Tirant," and always enters as "Tyrant" throughout the tragedy which he dominates. Tieck calls the piece *Der Tyrann, oder die zweite Jungfrauen Tragödie*, and gives *Der Tyrann* for the running title. These two bits

¹For discussions of the authorship of this tragedy, see *Englische Studien* II, 234; *Anglia* II, 47; and *Jahrbuch des deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* XXVII, 194.

of evidence—Tieck's title and the ms. itself—are sufficient to free Fleay (*Eng. Dram.*, II, 331) from the charge, or credit, of furnishing the piece with a new title.

Again in Hazlitt's Dodsley (Vol. x) *The Second Maid's Tragedy* appeared, but still with numerous mistakes. In 1875, Chatto & Windus printed it with the "Doubtful Plays and Fragments" of Chapman, and indicated in footnotes the lines and words that had been marked in the manuscript for correction or deletion. This was a great advance over all former reprints of the tragedy, but manifestly too carelessly done, especially in respect of the marginal marks in the original, for the scholar's use. Finally I determined to edit the play myself, when lo! after spending a week last summer on the ms., the Malone Society appeared with such a faithful reprint of *The Second Maydens Tragedy* (Reprints 1909 [1910] with facsimiles and pp. xiii + 78), prepared by the General Editor, W. W. Greg, that I was thankful I had been forestalled in the task.²

The Second Maid's Tragedy is probably the work of Philip Massinger, and the alterations in the manuscript which have been made in a different hand, and which by some have been fondly ascribed to Shakespeare, are probably the work of a scribe. But it is not my purpose, in this brief review, to enter into the question of the authorship. The Malone Reprint will furnish the best argument for those interested in this phase of the subject. The tragedy turns on the lust of an usurping tyrant for the daughter of one of his subjects who is used as a pander. The tragic action is intensified by having the deposed king (a man of genuine nobility) in love with the heroine (who is always called "the Lady" in the piece). To save her virtue, the young lady commits suicide. At this point begins the peculiar originality of the author. The tyrant's lust does not end with the death of his victim. When he learns of her fate, he sends for a painter to bring back the bloom to the pale cheeks. When the tyrant is

called to inspect the work of the artist (who, by the way, is the deposed king disguised), he is overjoyed at the simulation of life, and rushes to kiss the lips of the dead woman. Poison has been mixed with the paint, and the usurper's passion meets its just reward. The whole thing is grotesque and revolting to the last degree, but, nevertheless, powerful. There is an under-tragedy of great merit, but it is overshadowed by the main theme.

Apart from the interest in this tragedy as a work of dramatic art, there is a vast opportunity for study and conjecture in connection with the alterations and marginal marks in the manuscript (these have all been indicated, with slight exceptions, with the greatest fidelity in the Malone Reprint). These are numerous and of a most perplexing nature. In the first place, there are five slips of paper with substitutions or alterations for as many passages, ranging from 5 to 15 lines in length and involving, in one instance, five speeches. These slips are of the same kind of paper as the ms. sheet and in a different handwriting. Some of these are pasted opposite passages marked in the margin, others have no such marks. The different kinds of markings are still more confusing. Sometimes a bold stroke in ink is drawn through the line from left to right; other passages are crossed out by a line slanting a little from the vertical; while still other passages are indicated by a line drawn like a square bracket in the margin. In some instances there are interlineations (*e. g.*, l. 1354). Again, there are a number of crosses in the margin, some like the letter "x," some like the "+" mark. Sometimes the cross is a blue pencil mark, sometimes it is in ink—and usually the two appear together as though some one had first gone over the play and called attention to certain passages by one sign, and another followed using his own mark to attract attention. At least three hands appear in the writing, besides the stage directions; that of the original copyist, that of the Master of the Revels, and a third. One of these was probably the author's, the third, Dr. Greg calls the scribe. There are also at least two shades of ink, both brown. Only a portion of these

²This article was written early in 1911, and "last summer," of course, refers to 1910.

distinguishing characteristics does the editor of the Malone Reprints call attention to. For the scholar, the fact that certain marginal marks have been made with a blue pencil, others with pen and ink, is of quite as much importance as the difference in handwritings.

The alterations and deletions seem to be of three origins, not always clearly differentiated. Without doubt, many of the changes were made by the author himself on his own initiative, for the avoidance of redundancy, or for other apparent reasons. Then there are certain passages marked which are clearly the work of the Master of the Revels, for has he not told us in his license on the back of the manuscript that he has indicated certain "reformations" to be made in the tragedy? And, finally, for the sake of coherency or to further carry out the will of Buc as indicated by his strictures there are corrections apparently by the author or scribe. Aside from the deletions made by the author in the first instance, the passages marked for omission are, in general, of three kinds: those reflecting in too strong terms on tyrant kings, those reflecting on the nobility, and expletives considered as oaths. The question is, "How much of this work of excision was the work of Buc, how much that of the author?" The editor of the Reprint, relying almost entirely on the color of the ink, and the handwriting, finds only two alterations which can with complete certainty be ascribed to Buc. These are in l. 1354, where "great men" becomes "some men;" and l. 2403, where "I am poisoned" has been substituted for "yo^r kinges poisonsd." Two other changes have been ascribed to the Master "with reasonable certainty." The first occurs in the Tyrant's speech when he discovers the dead lady (ll. 1841-2). Addressing the body he says:

"hadst thou but ask't th' opynion of most ladies
thowd'st neuer come to this!"

In the first line, "many" has been substituted for "most." The other instance (ll. 1424-6) is of a similar character. Govianus the deposed king, in attributing the suicide of the lady to her love of honour and virtue, says,

"twas a straunge trick of her, few of yo^r ladies
in ordinary will belieue it, they abhor it
theile sooner kill them selues wth lust, than
for it;"

There are several other examples of substitutions and deletions made in deference to folk of rank. In l. 422 "brazen" has been substituted for "courtier" in "a Courtiers face;" "woman" for "courtier" in l. 713, and 91½ lines immediately following (ll. 716-24), reflecting on princes and kings, have been marked for omission. A long speech by Govianus (ll. 754-784), the best in the whole play, is heavily marked for deletion. One line is especially marked, viz., "as you perhapps will saie yo^r betters doe" (i. e., play the pander, the speech being addressed to the father of the lady). On these lines, with the others just mentioned, Mr. Greg risks only the comment "marked for omission," the inference being by the author or scribe. The length of the speech might, of course, account for the work having been done by the author; but then the line particularly marked seems significant. On the other hand, if it had been the work of the censor, it would seem that he would have stricken out the remainder of the speech which ends,

"But miserable notes that Conscience sings
that cannot truly praye, for flatteringe Kinges."

In l. 1545 a concession has been made to knight-hood, and the editor admits, with a question mark however, that it may have been done by Buc. The line runs:

"thers many a good knightes daughter is in
seruice,"

in which "mens" has been interlined for "knightes."

Although a half dozen expletives (to be considered in a moment) and two of the foregoing passages have been ascribed to Buc by the editor of the Malone Reprint, it is with a degree of timorousness that he does so. The difficulty which constantly confronted him in reaching definite conclusions respecting the origin of the numerous marks may be best judged from the following deleted couplet which closes a speech of the deposed king (ll. 2209-2210):

"Tyrant ile ryvne thee on a daungerous shelf,
thoe I be fore't to flie this land myself."

These lines are marked out in ink. Commenting, Greg says, "Internal evidence would strongly recommend [the deletion to be the work of Buc,] but the ink appears to be the same as that of the substitution in the previous line, which is clearly not by Buc." It is this stumbling-block of the different shades of ink which appear in the ms. that makes the editor over-cautious in assigning the various marked passages. On the other hand, he takes no notice of the blue pencil crosses in the margin—an evidence quite as significant as that arising out of the shades of ink. I may add here that no one, so far as I am aware, has ever before called attention to these blue pencil crosses. It is only fair, however, to point out that the editor sees the indirect work of the censor even when tangible proof is wanting. Personally, I think there is little doubt that Buc was responsible for most of the passages marked for omission which were too pointed against kingship and the nobility. Some of the best speeches have been excised, as for example, that of Govianus to the Tyrant (ll. 2358-69), beginning,

"O thow sacrilidgious villaine
thow thief of rest, robber of monuments," etc.

and the one at the end of the play (ll. 2429-31) where the Tyrant is called "Monster in synne."

When we come to the expletives ("life," "heart," etc.), the editor, still relying on the shades of ink, is scrupulously careful in his ascriptions. "Life" has been deleted ten times, five of which Greg places to the credit of the Master of the Revels; "heart" has been marked five times, three are given to Buc; "Bi'th masse" has been cut out once, not ascribed by the editor. Respecting these deletions of oaths he says: "On the whole it seems likely that most are due to the author, but in some cases it is legitimate to assume the influence, if not the actual work, of the censor. Particularly is this the case with the deletion of the expletives *heart* and *life*. In only a few instances does the ink appear dark enough to allow us to suppose the activity of Buc himself, but it is evident

that somebody took the hint and made a pretty thorough expurgation of the text." Notwithstanding this assertion, the manuscript and the Malone Reprint show that "life" was passed over three times (ll. 384, 630, 1383), "uds life" once (l. 2110), "mass" twice (ll. 246, 392), and "faith" or "yfaith" nine times (ll. 616, 1463, 1580, 1618, 1623, 1629, 1635, 1770, 2022). Thus, sixteen expletives were allowed, and sixteen were excised, so that, after all, the expurgation could not have been so very thorough. It may appear strange that any of these "oaths" should have been found objectionable; but it should be remembered that *The Second Maid's Tragedy* was written in the year of the King James Bible, and, besides, the most blasphemous of the Stuarts was likewise the most pious.

The editor's conclusions regarding the alterations and excisions have already been indicated. "For the majority of the corrections," he says in his preface to *The Second Maydens Tragedy*, "and probably the bulk of the deletions and omissions the author seems responsible, but there are obvious reasons for suspecting that in some cases at least he was acting under the inspiration of the censor. Glancing through the alterations and deletions in the text it is easy to imagine the hand of the official censor in more instances than a critical examination warrants." This is a perfectly safe position to maintain, but, on the other hand, it is none too sure a test to rely on the differences in the shades of ink employed in the ms., for these are often so slight as to defy detection. Furthermore, it does not follow, however likely, that all the corrections and deletions by the same hand were made at the same time and out of the same ink-well. And as for tracing the handwritings of the different persons responsible for the ms. as we have it, that test would break down to a considerable extent when it comes to an examination of the marked passages, for these are indicated by lines alone. I have already mentioned that the blue pencil marks are passed over by the editor without notice. It would seem a far safer basis for conjecture to assume that all the pencil marks are by the same hand than to depend on detect-

ing two slightly different shades of sepia. I do not wish to imply that the editor holds fast to the tests of handwriting and shades—he is anything but dogmatic. But these are practically the only tests applied and they do not leave us satisfied. The result is largely negative, or at best, with few exceptions, mere probability, whereas it would seem that there is a psychology back of all these marks and deletions to be found in the character of James I, and in the custom and practices of the Master of the Revels during his reign. We do know that James was strictly averse to profanity on the stage, and that he was particularly jealous of all political allusions that in any way reflected on kingship, which was not next to divinity, it was itself divine. In 1605 *Gowry* had been forbidden for political reasons, and the authors of *Eastward Ho!* got themselves into prison for certain flings at James and his carpet-bag Scotch knights. Following upon these incidents the authority of the Master of the Revels was greatly increased, and as the censor of the stage has always been the instrument of the throne, we may feel fairly confident that more of the deletions in *The Second Maid's Tragedy* were the direct work of Buc than the editor has ascribed to him. Except where the handwriting definitely proves the corrector to be other than the censor (as in the case of the excised redundant passages, the alterations made to preserve the coherence, and a few others) I am inclined to think that, in the first instance, Buc marked or deleted certain expletives and the more violent attacks on the Tyrant, as his master King James would have desired him to do. The ms. then went back to the author who possibly made additional alterations in keeping with those of the censor, and others to reestablish connections. If proofs for these conjectures are demanded, we should have to take refuge in the editor's stronghold.

WATSON NICHOLSON.

London, England.

FAUSTMISZELLEN

I. *Angeraucht Papier* und einiges mehr, "Urfaust" 1. Scene.

Ich habe mir die oft besprochenen Worte immer in folgender Weise erklärt. In den Büchern bis oben an die Decke hin—also nicht nur in den unten, am nächsten zurhand stehenden und am meisten gebrauchten—stecken überall die Leseseichen, regelrechte Zackenreihen bildend: das und nichts anderes, nennt man *besteckt*. Es deutet darauf hin, welch ungeheure Büchermassen Faust schon bewältigt hat. Und dass diese Papierstreifen angeräuchert sind, zeigt, wie viele Jahre die Studien schon absorbiert haben: seine besten Jahre, wo er die Schönheiten der Natur und das Leben mit seinem heissen Pulsschlag hätte genießen sollen, statt über den Schmökern zu brüten. Die Papierstreifen sind natürlich nur soweit angeräuchert als sie aus den Büchern heraussehen: Jeder Besucher alter Bibliotheken kennt Beispiele, wo diese Zettel, soweit sie im Buche stecken, ihre ursprüngliche Reinheit und Farbe unverändert behalten haben und darüber hinaus fast schwarz geworden sind.—Grammatisch steht der Deutung, die ich mir schon vor Jahren zurechtgelegt habe, und an der ich noch immer festhalte, nichts im Wege—auch wenn man sie, was nirgends so wenig Berechtigung als im *Urfaust* hat, mit strengen Augen ansieht. Prüfen wir sie im Zusammenhange des ganzen Abschnitts:

- 45 Weh! steck ich in dem Kerker noch
Verfluchtes dumpfes Mauerloch
Wo selbst das liebe Himmels Licht
Trüb durch gemahlte Scheiben bricht.
Beschränkt von all dem Bücherhauff
50 Den Würmer nagen, Staub bedekt
Und bis ans hohe Gewölb hinauf
Mit angeraucht Papier besteckt
Mit Gläsern Büchsen rings bestellt
Mit Instrumenten vollgepropft,
55 Uhrväter Hausrath drein gestopft,
Das ist deine Welt, das heisst eine Welt!

Die Interpunktion ist so, wie wir sie aus dieser Periode der Literatur und Goethes kennen. Von der in den Drucken angebrachten haben wir grundsätzlich abzusehen: Goethe wusste ja selbst nicht mehr genau, wie er seine Verse konstruieren sollte.—Worauf bezieht sich also *Beschränkt* usw.?

Auf *Kerker* und *Mauerloch* oder auf *Himmels Licht*? Beide Beziehungen sind möglich, und es ist nicht einzusehen, wie man aus besser fundierten Gründen als rein subjektivem Gefühl eine davon vorziehen kann. Das *Himmels Licht* ist *beschränkt*, kann nicht das ganze Gemach erfüllen, weil die Repositorien, mit Büchern vollgestellt, die Schränke und Tische mit Gläsern, Büchsen und Instrumenten vollgepropft, und anderes Kram so viel Raum einnehmen, dass das Zimmer dunkel wird. Wäre diese Auffassung richtig, dann würde also das *Trüb* in den Versen 49–55 erklärt, und *gemahlte Scheiben* lediglich Ergänzung der Angabe *In einem hochgewölbten engen gothischen Zimmer* sein. An diesen Scheiben war ja doch auch nichts auszusetzen. Der Punkt vor *Beschränkt* hat natürlich geradesowenig zu sagen wie das Komma vor *Das ist deine Welt*.—Bezieht man dagegen *Beschränkt* auf *Kerker* und *Mauerloch*—wobei es einerlei ist, ob man *wo* an das erste oder zweite Wort anschliesst—dann liefern die Verse 49–55 einfach eine Beschreibung der Lokalität. Irrelevant ist die Unsicherheit aber für die Auffassung der Verse 49–52 in sich. Der erste Zusatz zu *Bücherhauff*, die Worte *Den Würmer nagen*, kann kaum als vollwertiger Relativsatz angesprochen werden: er ersetzt ein 'würmerbenagt' oder 'von Würmern benagt' nach Analogie des biblischen *Schätze, die Motten und Rost zerfressen*. Darum wird *Staub bedekt* schon mehr als Nominativ des Participiums und als ein Wort empfunden, wozu die Schreibung in zwei durchaus nicht im Widerspruch steht; und ihm parallel geht dann ein 'papierbesteckt,' nur wegen des hinzutretenden Adjektivs in *mit angeraucht Papier besteckt* auseinandergezogen.

Wem diese Erklärung nicht zusagt, der mag einfach *Staub bedekt* als noch voll vom Relativum *Den* abhängig ansehen, aber für den folgenden Vers ein Subjekt herausziehen: ein Vorgang, der ja doch in dem populären, naturwüchsigen, unentwickelten Stil, wie er der Epoche eigen war, durchaus nichts ungewöhnliches ist. Der Satz *Mit Gläsern, Büchsen rings bestellt* . . . geht dann wieder dem *Beschränkt* . . . parallel, die Parenthese umfasst also die Verse 50–52. Wie lose die Konstruktion in solchen Fällen wie diesem hier werden kann, dafür noch zwei Beispiele. Das eine aus dem vorhergehenden Abschnitt:

O sähest du voller Mondenschein
Zum letzten mal auf meine Pein
Den ich so manche Mitternacht
An diesem Pult heran gewacht.
Dann über Bücher und Papier
Trübseelger Freund erschienst du mir.

Das andere aus dem *Trauergesang* nach Euphoriens Sturz:

Ach! zum Erdenglück geboren,
Hoher Ahnen, grosser Kraft,
Leider! früh dir selbst verloren,
Jugendblüthe weggerafft.
Scharfer Blick die Welt zu schauen,
Mitsinn jedem Herzensdrang,
Liebesgluth der besten Frauen
Und ein eigenster Gesang.

Wenn es sich nicht um eine Bibliothek, sondern um ein Archiv handelte, wenn es 'Aktenhauf' statt *Bücherhauff* hiesse, dann hätte ich eine andere gute Erklärung parat. Der Inhalt von einzelnen Aktenfaszikeln oder von ganzen Aktenbündeln, wofern sie gelegt, nicht gestellt sind, wird noch heute, wie seit langem, in manchen Archiven dadurch kenntlich gemacht, dass man ihn auf Streifen oder Blätter Papiers schreibt und diese mit ihren oberen Teil zwischen die Akten steckt und mit dem beschriebenen Teil vorn heraushängen lässt. Wenn die Aktenstösse verschürt sind, zieht man auch den Bindfaden durch das Papier. Ich habe mich selbst davon überzeugt, dass dies schon im achtzehnten Jahrhundert gebräuchlich gewesen ist. Man muss solche Archive in *hochgewölbten gotischen* Räumen gesehen haben, wo die Aktenbündel mit diesem Zettel gespickt, auf denen die Worte kaum noch zu lesen sind, bis oben an die Decke in den Regalen aufgespeichert liegen. Ich kenne sie gerade aus den Schlössern wetterauischer Reichsunmittelbarer, zu denen Goethe Beziehungen unterhalten hat. Es handelt sich da natürlich nicht nur um Handschriftliches, sondern auch um Gedrucktes, vor allem um die zahlreichen Broschüren in Rechtsstreitigkeiten—immer aber um Ungebundenes, das eben nur gelegt werden kann. Aber wie gesagt, Faust sitzt in einem Studierzimmer, nicht in einem Archive. In jenem gibt es wol einzelne Papierstösse, aber nicht ganze Reihen, die das Verbum *bestecken* voraussetzt. Denn von der Vorstellung, die wir nun einmal damit verbinden, und an der mich auch die paar—letz-

ten Endes übrigens doch gleichartigen—Beispiele Grimms (Wb 1, 1665) aus Hartmann von Aue, Schede und Grimmelshausen nicht irre machen, darf man nicht abgehen: Es ragt nicht nur der Gegenstand, mit dem ein Ding besteckt ist, aus dem letzteren heraus, wie der Merktzettel aus dem Buch oder das Inhaltsschild aus den Akten und Bündeln und diese damit oder an sich schon aus den Repositorien, sondern es liegt auch der Begriff einer Mehrheit der ragenden Gegenstände, selbst bis zu ihrer regelmässigen Verteilung hin—hier handelte es sich natürlich nur um diesen Eindruck—vor: Wenn das Buch besteckt ist, dann stecken mehrere, wenn der Bücherhaufe besteckt ist, zahlreiche Zettel darin.

Daran hält ja wol auch Minor (Goethes Faust 1, 38 ff.) fest: aber ganz und gar nicht kann ich mich mit dem Grundzug seiner Deutung befreunden. *Besteckt* soll sich schon wieder auf *Mauerloch* beziehen, also nur Vers 50 Parenthese sein, und unter dem Papier sollen *Handschriften, eigene und fremde* zu verstehen sein. Auf die Art, wie Minor das letztere an der Hand anderer Stellen plausibel zu machen versucht, lässt sich alles beweisen. Weil Herder 1769 im Journal seiner Reise, in ähnlicher Stimmung wie Faust die verlorenen Jahre beklagend, geschrieben hatte, er sei ein *Repositorium voll Papiere und Bücher geworden, das nur in die Studierstube gehöre*, so soll das ganz in *Übereinstimmung mit unserer Stelle* sein! Weil der Mond Fausten so oft *über Bücher und Papier* erschienen ist, weil Goethe in der Morphologie neben Präparaten der *Papiere*, seiner handschriftlichen Vorarbeiten, gedenkt, weil nachher im ersten Teil Faust eine alte, vom Vater ererbte, vor ihm daliegende *Rolle*—sei sie aus Papier oder Pergament—anspricht, die, seit er bei der Lampe arbeite, angeräuchert sei, und weil überall das Studierzimmer Lokalität ist: so müssen alle diese Papiere und Rollen mit unserm Papier, das *bis zur Decke hinauf* irgend etwas *besteckt*, gleichbedeutend sein? Und beweist der Hinweis auf Knebels Bericht, Goethe habe seine *Manuskripte*—nicht *Papiere*, um genau zu citieren: Deutsche Rundschau 1877, 519—*aus allen Winkeln seines Zimmers hervorgezogen*, beweist das etwa, dass sie überall zwischen den Büchern, wo ein freier Platz war, bis oben an die Decke hinauf gesteckt? Im Gegenteil: dass sie nicht, oder zu einem grossen Teil nicht, zwischen den

Büchern, sondern in Ecken, Kasten, Schubladen und sonst, wo man sie nicht erwartete, herumgelegen haben! Überhaupt sollte man sich hüten, des jungen Goethe freundlich-helles Studierzimmerchen, von dem wir zufällig dies und das wissen, zur Illustration von Fausts dumpfem hochgewölbtem gotischen Gemach herbeizuzerren. So etwas muss missglücken. Und wo bleibt die Ähnlichkeit zwischen den beiden Insassen, die man doch verlangen muss, ehe man auch nur dran denken kann, Vergleiche, welcher Art sie seien, zu ziehen? Vor allem aber fragt man: Da Faust, die dumpfe Enge seines Mauerlochs beseufzend und verfluchend, zuerst die in den Repositorien stehenden Bücherreihen erwähnt, warum wird nicht, wie es natürlich, schon von ihnen gesagt, dass sie bis oben ans Gewölbe reichen? Und dann, wie komisch der Gedanke: Überall hat Faust seinerzeit zwischen den Büchern, bis oben an die Decke hin, leere Stellen gelassen, und überall ist er nachher hingeklettert und hat Handschriften hingesteckt! Aus Eignem tut Minor hinzu, dass diese Handschriften *eigene und fremde* seien: dieser überflüssige Zusatz, offenbar darum erfunden, weil eines Menschen Handschriften nicht ausreichen, um so zahlreiche leere Räume an allen Wänden herum und bis zur Decke hinauf auszufüllen, ist nicht mal seiner Deutung günstig, denn indem er fremde hinzumischt, nimmt er den *Handschriften* einen sie wesentlich von den Büchern unterscheidenden Zug; Fausts eigne Handschriften allein wären etwas besonders zu nennendes gewesen, mit fremden Handschriften zusammen sind sie lediglich geschriebene Bücher. Auch macht Minor, indem er *jeden freien Platz zwischen den Büchern* mit den vermeintlichen Handschriften ausgestopft sieht, seiner eignen Beziehung von *besteckt* auf *Mauerloch* Konkurrenz.—Noch ein Satz zur Kennzeichnung dieser Art von Erklärungen: *die Handschriften, die nicht bloss im sechzehnten Jahrhundert, sondern auch in der Bibliothek des jungen Goethe ins Auge fielen, der . . . die Papiere aus allen Winkeln hervorzog*. Dass in der Bibliothek des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts Handschriften ins Auge fielen, ist ad hoc erdacht, und dass sie in Goethes Bibliothek nicht ins Auge fielen, ergibt sich grade aus dem Umstand, dass sie aus allen Winkeln erst hervorgezogen werden mussten.

Ich halte also daran fest: die Worte *bis ans*

hohe Gewölb hinauf. . . sind nicht dazu da, die Schilderung des Gemachs um einen weiteren äusseren Zug zu vermehren—wie könnte das auch durch diese Erwähnung von Handschriften geschehen?—sondern haben einen etwas tieferen Sinn, meinem Gefühl nach denjenigen, der in meiner eingangs mitgeteilten Deutung niedergelegt ist. Wenn mir hier, nach Minor S. 40, eingewendet werden sollte, dass die Papiere oben an der Decke noch stärker angeräuchert seien als unten—so etwas sieht wol Faust des Nachts genau oder denkt in diesem Augenblick daran?—und darum der Zug in dieser Form erwähnt werde, so frage ich, ebenfalls nach Minor, der ja doch einen so intimen Zusammenhang zwischen der *Rolle* und dem *Papier* annimmt: Steckt die angeräucherte Rolle oben unter der Decke oder liegt sie Fausten nahe zuhanden, vielleicht gar auf dem Pulte vor ihm?

Nachwort. Ich sehe eben aus einem, nebenbei gesagt grauenhaft stilisierten, Satz in R. M. Meyers Artikel *Angeraucht Papier*, Euphorion 3, 102, dass die oben vorgelegte Deutung schon von Düntzer und Schröer gefunden war. Umso besser: meine Begründung behält ihr Gewicht. Meyers eigne Deutung: *Der Bücherhauf des einsamen Gelehrten ist besteckt mit seinen eignen Papieren, denen inzwischen die Zeit den trügerischen Schein altertümlichen Werts verliehen hat, wird wol nirgends Freunde gefunden haben.* Das wäre ein merkwürdiger Wert. Wie kann im Ernste die Stelle aus der Italienischen Reise verglichen werden!

II. Zu Goethe-Jahrbuch 32, 181.

Mit Recht ist der Zweck der kleinen Miszelle nur zaghaft in der Überschrift, *Zur Chronologie von Faust I*, 3776 f., angedeutet. Dass diese Chronologie der von massgebenden Faustforschern (Erich Schmidt, *Urfaust* XII; Minor 1, 13) vertretenen Ansicht widerspräche; Goethe habe in den zehn ersten Weimarer Jahren nichts am Faust gearbeitet, schadete natürlich gar nichts: ich werde demnächst zeigen, dass in der Weimarer Zeit sogar sehr wichtige Parteen entstanden sind. Aber diese Parallele hier ist sehr bedenklich: Was ist denn eigentlich gleich? Die fünf Worte *Wie anders, als . . . Kopf . . . Herz!* Weiter nichts, und die paar Bemerkungen, die der Einsender zugibt, sind von Anfang bis Ende, von der *Geringschätzung* an, mit der der *Dichter(!)* auf seine *unentwickelte Jugend* zurücksehen soll,

bis zu der ins *Gegenteil* umgekehrten Wirkung ganz unklare Redensarten.

Dort wird sich ein welt- und herzenskundiger, geistig vollentwickelter Mann bei einem äusseren Anlass mit einem Male klar bewusst, wie mächtig sich Geist und Herz in dem Zeitraum von zehn Jahren, in denen der Jüngling zum Mann wird, entwickelt haben, aus dem traumhaft-dumpfen Zustand zum kräftig-freien Bewusstsein; und er gedenkt daran, was für innere Erfahrungen diese Entwicklung befruchtet haben. Hier drängt der böse Geist dem Kinde, das fast über Nacht zum Weibe geworden ist, den Vergleich zwischen dem Gestern und dem Heute auf: gestern noch fröhlich, kindlich-gläubig, unschuldig, heute in Schuld, Gewissensqual und wahnsinniger Angst, nach einem einzigen Fehltritt! Und wie kann man *Kopf* und *Herz* an den beiden Stellen miteinander vergleichen! *Mein armer Kopf! Ist mir verrückt / . . . Mein Herz ist schwer* hatte Gretchen ein paar Szenen vorher selbst gesagt.

Wo kommt man hin, wenn man auf ein paar äusserlich gleiche Worte chronologische Annahmen gründet! Es ist nur ein Glück, dass auf dem Titelblatt des *Werther* die Jahreszahl 1774 steht. Ich wollte mich sonst anheischig machen, zu 'beweisen,' dass zwei, nebenbeigesagt 80 Seiten von einander entfernt stehende Stellen, bei 191 Seiten Gesamtumfang, unbedingt im März 1776 entstanden sein müssten, und diesmal auf Grund von wirklichen Übereinstimmungen! *Werther* will in die Heimat, sich der *alten, glücklich verträumten Tage* zu erinnern (WA 19, 108). Das schreibt er auch in einem Briefe, wie Goethe an Charlotte. *Zu eben dem Thore will ich hinein gehn . . .* Und ein paar Tage später berichtet er dann: *An der grossen Linde . . . liess ich halten, stieg aus und hiess den Postillon fortfahren, um zu Fusse jede Erinnerung ganz neu, lebhaft, nach meinem Herzen zu kosten. Da stand ich nun unter der Linde, die ehemals, als Knabe, das Ziel und die Gränze meiner Spaziergänge gewesen. Wie anders! Damals sehnte ich mich in glücklicher Unwissenheit hinaus in die unbekannte Welt, wo ich für mein Herz so viel Nahrung, so vielen Genuss hoffte, meinen strebenden, sehnenden Busen auszufüllen und zu befriedigen. Jetzt komme ich zurück aus der weiten Welt o mein Freund, mit wie viel fehlgeschlagenen Hoffnungen, mit wie viel*

zerstörten Planen! . . . Ich erinnerte mich der Unruhe, der Thränen, der Dumpfheit des Sinnes, der Herzensangst, die ich in dem Loche ausgestanden hatte . . . Und stimmten nicht auch die Namen der Adressatin und der Heldin des Romans schön zusammen?—An der zweiten Stelle handelt es sich um eine Frau. Lotte fühlt die wütenden Küsse Werthers noch nach durchwachter Nacht auf ihren Lippen brennen. *Ihr sonst so rein und leicht fließendes Blut war in einer fieberhaften Empörung, tausenderlei Empfindungen zerrütteten das schöne Herz. War es das Feuer von Werthers Umarmungen, das sie in ihrem Busen fühlte? war es Unwille über seine Verwegenheit? war es eine unmuthige Vergleichung ihres gegenwärtigen Zustandes mit jenen Tagen ganz unbefangener freier Unschuld und sorglosen Zutrauens an sich selbst? Wie sollte sie ihrem Manne entgegen gehen?* (WA 19, 181).

Will man also absolut Parallelen finden, so können es nur die zwischen der zuletzt citierten Stelle und der Gretchenscene einerseits, anderseits zwischen der zuerst citierten und der Briefstelle sein: beide nebeneinander böten dann eine deutlich erkennbare Warnungstafel für allzu schnelle Fahrer dar.

III. Zu MINOR, Goethes Faust 2, 229.

Es soll hier nicht über so oberflächliche und äusserliche Betrachtungen gerechnet werden, wie diese: *Weniger kann es auffallen, dass dort, wo die Grenzen der Zeiten ineinanderfliessen und(!) der Faust des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts neben dem Nicolai des achtzehnten auftritt, auch Gretchen als Zukunftsbild in einer Situation erscheint, die hinter den Schluss der ganzen Gretchentragödie fällt.* Kunstgriffe dieser Art hätte Minor wirklich nicht nötig. Aber die ganze Stelle, wo dieser Satz erscheint, leidet an grosser Unklarheit. Es handelt sich um den Schluss des Paralipomenon 50 (WA 14, 310f.). Da heisst es *Hochgerichterscheinung*, dann folgt in zwei Strophen ein von einem Chor gesungenes Blutlied, dann weiter: *Gedräng—Sie ersteigen einen Baum—Reden des Volcks—Auf glühndem Boden—Nackt das Idol—Die Hände auf dem Rücken—Bedeckt nicht das Gesicht und nicht die Scham—Gesang—Der Kopf fällt ab—Das Blut springt und löscht das Feuer—Nacht—Rauschen—Geschwätz von Kielkröpfen—*

Dadurch Faust erfährt. Dazu bemerkt Minor, die Hände seien dem Idol auf den Rücken gebunden, wie einer armen Sünderin auf dem letzten Wege. Ob das bei denen geschah, weiss ich nicht: bei dieser kann es nicht geschehen sei. Wie sollte sonst das *Bedeckt nicht das Gesicht und nicht die Scham* zu erklären sein? Bedeckt kann nicht Participium sein, auch beim schnellsten Schreiben würde es geheissen haben 'Nicht bedeckt' oder 'Unbedeckt.' Und wenn es vorher heisst: *Nackt das Idol*, dann ist gar nicht einzusehen, warum dazu noch Ausführungsbestimmungen gegeben werden, wenn dem Mädchen die Hände auf den Rücken gebunden sind. Es liesse sich noch erklären, wenn allein die zweite der beiden Einzelheiten bekräftigen würde: 'nicht einmal die Scham.' Aber das Gesicht? Völlig klar wird die Sache durch folgende Deutung: Obgleich sie ganz nackt ist und die Hände frei hat, bedeckt die arme Sünderin dennoch nicht vor Scham ihr Gesicht und ihre Blösse, sondern geht frei und ungeniert dahin. Es ist gar keine Frage: Legt eine solche Delinquentin die Hände auf den Rücken, so ist das schon mehr Herausforderung, Schamlosigkeit. Aber die ist hier gänzlich ausgeschlossen: es bleibt also die, übrigens nahe-liegende, Annahme einer suggerierenden Wirkung der Situation, in der die Fesselung integrierender Bestandteil zu sein pflegte. In dieser Annahme wird man noch sicherer, wenn man sieht, wie Goethe weiterhin, in der Walpurgisnachtszene des ersten Teils 4185 sagt: *Sie schiebt sich langsam nur vom Ort, | Sie scheint mit geschloss'nen Füssen zu gehen.*—Als äusseres Zeichen der freien, sorglosen Lässigkeit erwartet man also nicht, dass die Hände auf den Rücken gelegt werden, sondern dass sie frei, ungezwungen herabhängen. Und dieser Zug findet sich in der Quelle, aus der ihn Goethe, wie ich ebenfalls an anderer Stelle zeigen werde, geschöpft hat. Wenn nun für das Wort *Kielkropf* eine Erklärung gegeben wird, die man in jedem Konversationslexicon fände, falls man nicht Bescheid wissen sollte, so nimmt sich das merkwürdig aus neben der Nicht-erklärung des Zugs vom *glühenden Boden*. Wo ist der Boden glühend? Nur dort, wo das Idol geht? Oder dort, wo es hingerichtet wird? Und warum glüht er dort? Was bedeutet das Löschen mit dem Blut?

Die merkwürdigste Deutung hat das *Rauschen* gefunden. Ausgerechnet nach dieser Hinrichtungsscene sollen wie beim Anstieg zum Brocken 3881 ff. rauschende Bäche— hätten sie nicht auch die ganze Zeit her gerauscht?—Erinnerungen jener *Himmelstage* in Faust wach machen! Da könnte man doch, vorab nach den letzten Versen des Blutlieds, noch eher an das Rauschen des Blutbaches denken, der noch nicht verströmt sei. Viel näher liegt doch folgende Deutung. In den Lüften singen gierige Geister das Blutlied (später werden sie von Mephistopheles eine *Hexenzunft* genannt), sie freuen sich auf das neue Blutopfer. Das Volk drängt sich herum, Zeugen der kommenden Scene zu sein. Faust und Mephisto ersteigen darum einen Baum, von dem aus sie besser sehen können. Das Volk bespricht sich erregt: wird dies kindlichfröhliche Geschöpf wirklich die ganze Härte des Gesetzes zu erdulden haben oder wird der letzte Augenblick ihre Begnadigung bringen? Aber da naht die Unglückliche schon; sie schämt sich nicht, obwol sie völlig nackt; mit eben der sorglosen Lässigkeit, die man an ihr kannte, schreitet sie zum Blutgerüste; wo sie geht, glüht der Boden; der Kopf fällt; das Blut löscht das Feuer; Finsternis bedeckt die Scene, denn nun schwirren und rauschen sie heran die scheusslichen Gestalten, die sich immer dichter herzugedrängt hatten, deren Gesang immer gieriger geworden war. In der ersten Strophe des Blutlieds war allgemein von der zauberischen Kraft heissen Menschenbluts gesprochen, in der zweiten von Fällen, wo es vergossen wird. Um des geilen Blicks einer Dirne willen—Marlowes Ende!—, oder in der Trunkenheit fährt die Hand jach zum Messer, und das Blut strömt. Aber Menschenblut wird nur durch Menschenblut gesühnt, Blutschuld fordert immer neue Opfer; über des Erschlagenen Stätte schweben rächende Geister, die auf den rückkehrenden Mörder lauern (Urfaust 82, 55): nie rieselt ein Blutquell allein. Was die weiteren Strophen, die zweimal angedeutet werden, gebracht hätten, mag man sich an der Hand anderer Beispiele ausdenken. Ich weise noch auf Bürgers *Wilden Jaeger* hin, von dem Goethe durch Bürger selbst und Boie wusste, ob er auch viel später erst fertig geworden ist.—Aus dem Geschwätz scheusslicher Fratzen gestalten vernimmt Faust, dass das, was er da eben mit ange-

sehen hat, Abbild grauenvoller Wahrheit ist: Gretchen war in dem Augenblick hingerichtet worden.

Nur noch eins: Wenn die Deutung, die ich oben für die Worte *Nackt das Idol usw.* vorgeschlagen habe, richtig ist, dann weist dies Paralipomenon sehr weit zurück, in eine Zeit, wo die Gestalt Gretchens noch nicht die festen Züge angenommen hatte, die der Urfaust uns vorführt. Da ich anderseits einen genauen terminus post quem für die genannten Worte festlegen kann, so wird sich eine erneute Prüfung der Frage: war die Gretchentragödie bei Goethes Eintritt in Weimar im wesentlichen fertig? nicht umgehen lassen.

G. SCHAAFFS.

St. Andrews, Scotland.

THE SOURCE OF GRESSET'S *MÉCHANT*

The source of Gresset's *Méchant* has been assigned to various plays. As soon as it was produced, Fréron pointed out the similarity between it and the *Médisant* by Destouches.¹ La Harpe, in an article evidently written before 1789, claims that the plot was copied from the *Flatteur* by J. B. Rousseau.² He calls attention to the fact that the characters designated by the titles of the two comedies both wish to prevent the marriage of a friend; and in both cases it is the valet, won over by a maid, who unmasks the traitor. Petit de Julleville adds the *Petit maître corrigé* by Marivaux to the list of sources,³ while Lenient indicates *Tartufe* as the model of the character of Cléon if not the source of the plot.⁴ Wogue says that Gresset did not go to the trouble of imagining his plots, but borrowed the action of his plays from Molière. He called the *Méchant* a traditional subject: the combatted love affair.⁵

¹ Lenient, *la Comédie au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1888, vol. 1, p. 244.

² La Harpe, *Lycée ou cours de littérature ancienne et moderne*, Paris, 1818. Vol. 10, p. 303.

³ Petit de Julleville, *le Théâtre en France*. Paris, 1901; p. 291.

⁴ *loc. cit.*

⁵ Wogue, *J-B-L. Gresset*. Paris, 1892; p. 186.

The model of the character of Cléon was sought for among Gresset's contemporaries. Argenson says in his *Mémoires* (Dec. 21, 1747) that Cléon is a composite of Maurepas, the duc d'Ayen, and his own brother. The duc de Chaulnes, Forcalquier, and the duc de Choiseul have also been given the doubtful honor of having served as pattern.⁶ It is quite possible that Gresset had one or more of these men in mind while he was writing his play. Also it is true that all of these plays mentioned show points of similarity, because none of them would have been written had not the *Tartufe* been an unfailing source of inspiration. However, the immediate source of Gresset's *Méchant* seems to be in still another play which also recalls Molière's comedy, namely, Congreve's *Double Dealer*. It may appear surprising to find the source of a French play in English Restoration comedy, which was itself so strongly influenced by French drama; yet in the case of Gresset our surprise is somewhat lessened if we remember the fact that his family was of English origin. "It is perhaps that origin," says Gazier, "which explains the English character of his first tragedy, *Edouard III*, and of his first comedy, *Sidney*." We may add that perhaps it helps to explain the English source of his *Méchant*, especially if it be remembered that he was a man of wide culture.

It is true that Gresset's knowledge and interest in English literature may not appear very extensive at first blush, if they are measured only by reference to English authors and things English in his works. He knew and admired Milton's works, for he mentions Milton in the same breath with Camoëns in his *Epître à ma muse*. He denies in the preface to *Edouard III* that the scene in which blood is shed on the stage is due to English influence.⁷ No doubt he is sincere in making this statement; but it proves he was acquainted with English drama to some extent. In his play, *Sidney*, the scene is laid in England and he portrays a

character filled with a kind of *mal du siècle* and suicidal mania who may well be a forerunner of later romantic heroes. Thus Gresset was at least interested in the land of spleen; and he cried out against imitating English customs both in his *Réponse à Suard* and in the *Gazetin*. Therefore, while he does not make many references to English literature, he must have been in touch with it.

In what way, however, did he come in contact with Congreve's *Double Dealer*? He probably did not have access to a published translation, as this play does not appear to have been translated until 1775 by Peyron under the title *Le Fourbe*.⁸ La Place included two of Congreve's plays in his *Théâtre anglais*, namely, *Love for Love* and the *Mourning Bride*. Of course, Gresset may have read the *Double Dealer* in the original. I have found no evidence as to whether he could read English or not. However that may be, one is struck by the coincidence that La Place was publishing these two plays of Congreve at the same time that Gresset seems to have been borrowing from the *Double Dealer*. The *Théâtre anglais* is dated 1745-1748. The date of the *Méchant* is 1747.⁹ Also, Gresset was a constant frequenter of the hôtel de Chaulnes and must have met La Place there, since the latter was one of the intimate

⁶ Cushing, *Pierre Le Tourneur*, New York, 1908, p. 86, note 1.

⁷ The date of the *Méchant* is unquestionably April 27, 1747; but through a misprint the date April 27, 1745 is often given. This would make the *Méchant* prior to *Sidney*, which was produced May 3, 1745; and that is out of the question. This misprint dates back at least to 1802, and it occurs in the following editions of the play which have come to my notice. *Edition Nicolle*. Paris, 1802. (The date is corrected in the reprint of 1821). *Répertoire du Théâtre Français* par Petitot. Paris, 1817. Vol. 14. *Chefs-d'œuvre des auteurs comiques*. Firmin-Didot. Vol. 5. Also the mistake occurs in the following critical works. Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, Paris, 1902; p. 657 and p. 1133. Lintilhac, *La Comédie au dix-huitième siècle*, Paris, 1909, p. 293 and p. 485. Weiss, *Essais sur l'histoire de la littérature française*. Paris, 1891, p. 326. Gazier gives the correct date on page 508, but gives 1745 on page 512. (*Revue des cours et conférences*, 1910.)

⁸ Wogue, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

⁹ Herrenchwand, *J-B-L. Gresset*, Murten, 1895, p. 182.

friends of M. and Mme. de Chaulnes.¹⁰ Gresset was, therefore, in touch with a man who was extremely interested in Congreve; and the coincidence in dates takes on a new meaning. It is surely not too hazardous to conjecture that La Place may have brought the *Double Dealer* to Gresset's notice; and if Gresset could not read English, he may have explained the plot to him. He may only have aroused Gresset's interest in it; but at least we realize that Gresset could hardly escape knowing the play, and it is not quite so remarkable, under these circumstances, that he borrowed the plot of the *Méchant* from Congreve.

If we compare the casts of the two plays, we find the following correspondence between the *dramatis personae*. The *Double Dealer*, himself, is characterized by Congreve as "Maskwell, a Villain; pretended friend to Mellefont, gallant to Lady Touchwood, and in love with Cynthia." This character is the *Méchant* who, in turn, is a villain, pretended friend to Valère, gallant to Florise and in love with Chloé. Mellefont, "promised to and in love with Cynthia," is the counterpart of Valère, promised to and in love with Chloé, who corresponds to the English Cynthia. Lady Touchwood is at first in love with Mellefont in the *Double Dealer*, but she is afterward in love with Maskwell and becomes his coadjutress. This character is Gresset's Florise, who, though not in love with Valère at any time, is yet in love with Cléon and becomes his coadjutress in attempting to keep Chloé and Valère apart. Lord Touchwood and Sir Paul Plyant coalesce into the one character of Géronte. The degree of relationship is somewhat changed between Géronte and Chloé, he being her uncle, while in the *Double Dealer*, Sir Paul Plyant is Cynthia's father, and Touchwood is Mellefont's uncle. But as Touchwood first favors his nephew and then will hear no good of him, so Géronte first favors his young friend Valère, but becomes strongly prejudiced against him. Another point of similarity between these characters lies in the fact that Sir Paul Plyant, true to his name, is hen-pecked,

while Géronte, though not so ridiculous, weakens before Florise. (Act 1, sc. 1.) It cannot be said that Ariste has any prototype in the English comedy. He warns Valère against Cléon and this warning is delivered to Mellefont by Careless; but beyond that, the two have nothing in common. However, neither is of vital importance to the action. Lisette and Frontin are the stock soubrette and valet, inevitable in French comedy; and we need not look for their source in the English version. Of course, in Congreve's play there are other characters, but the main plot could be unfolded without them. Indeed, had the dramatist preserved the unity of action, practically none of them would have appeared.

Immediately after the curtain rises on the first act of the *Méchant*, we hear Lisette regret to Frontin that his master, Cléon, is preventing the marriage of Valère and Chloé in an underhanded way, while he pretends to favor it. This is the mainspring of the plots of both plays. Géronte informs Lisette that the marriage shall take place in spite of Florise, and that his fortune is promised to Chloé. Lisette replies that Florise will object, that she is in love with Cléon, and that she takes him as counsellor. The same situation arises in the *Double Dealer* with the exception that Lord Touchwood's money is promised to the young lover. On the other hand, Lady Touchwood takes Maskwell as counsellor, and is in love with him from the end of the first act.

In the second act of the *Méchant*, Cléon confesses that he is making love to both mother and daughter. He much prefers the daughter; and he believes it possible that Géronte may send Valère away, and that he may get the daughter and the money. In the *Double Dealer* (Act 5, sc. 1.), Lord Touchwood even goes so far as to say that he will make Maskwell his heir; and of course Maskwell always prefers Cynthia to Lady Touchwood and uses her merely as a foil. Florise becomes suspicious that Cléon is favoring Valère's marriage; but Cléon calms her and shows her how to put an end to the match. In the last scene of the third act of the English play, Lady Touchwood

¹⁰ Wogue, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

is suspicious of Maskwell because he is betraying his friend; but Maskwell makes love to her and also shows her how to prevent the marriage of the two lovers.

In the third act of the *Méchant*, Ariste warns Valère against Cléon, just as Careless warns Mellefont against Maskwell in the first act of the *Double Dealer*. Letters arrive in which Cléon accuses himself, while Maskwell accuses himself verbally to his friends in order to allay suspicion. Both scenes produce the same effect. From the end of the third act when Valère finds himself desperately in love with Chloé, the situation is the same in both plays. In the next act, Cléon continues his double dealing by defending Ariste to Géronte. He tells Lisette of his love for Chloé, and draws an uncomplimentary picture of Florise, who overhears it while she is concealed in a cabinet. Maskwell, in the third act, says he is tired of Lady Touchwood; and Lord Touchwood informs his wife of this fact, being unaware of the true state of his wife's feelings. His eyes are opened to the real situation by the same dramatic trick of an overheard conversation. In the last act of the *Méchant*, the eyes of Florise are opened; but Géronte will believe nothing in favor of Valère or against Cléon, with whom he now has an understanding, until the French Double Dealer is unmasked. Lord Touchwood, in the same way, will believe nothing good of Mellefont and considers Maskwell his friend until the English Double Dealer is discredited. The two plays have entirely the same outcome.

The English comedy contains many scenes which do not advance the action, but which are merely introduced, according to Congreve's method, for the sake of humor. These scenes naturally do not occur in the French play, which observes the unity of action. The scene in the bed-room, which forms the climax of the *Double Dealer*, is also impossible on the French stage of the period. But the principal characters, the motives actuating them, the main plot, the cool double dealing of the two so-called villains are so strikingly similar that we must conclude that Gresset was consciously influenced

by Congreve to a very great extent. Surely the *Méchant* is the *Double Dealer* in French surroundings.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

Princeton University.

THE DATE OF THE ENVOY TO BUKTON

The *Envoy to Bukton* is commonly dated about the end of the year 1396, on the assumption that the closing lines of the fourth stanza—

Experience shal thee teche, so may happe,
That thee were lever to be take in Fryse
Than eft to falle of wedding in the trappe—

refer to the expedition of William of Hainault, described by Froissart in the fourth book of the *Chronicles*.¹ So conclusive has this supposed evidence been regarded, that Professor Tatlock, in the latest discussion of the chronological relations of the poem, not only remarks that "the date of *Bukton* may be fixed with great exactness and certainty," but also declares that the date assigned by Professor Skeat "is absolutely and exactly established."² I do not wish categorically to assert that the date of *Bukton* is *not* the close of 1396; but I do desire to point out that considerable caution should still be exercised in drawing exact chronological conclusions from the reference to being "take in Fryse."

Professor Kittredge has already made it quite clear³ that the *Envoy* as a whole must be interpreted in the light of certain literary conventions and may not be taken too seriously as a chapter in Chaucer's autobiography. To the illustrations which he has drawn from

¹ See Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 85, 558-59; Tatlock, *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works* (Chaucer Soc., 1907), p. 211.

² *Development and Chronology*, p. 211.

³ *Modern Language Notes*, XXIV, No. 1 (Jan., 1909), pp. 14-15.

Deschamps still others might be added;⁴ and there can be little doubt of the essentially conventional nature of the poem. Moreover, the stock character of the analogy between marriage and bondage in an enemy's country is obvious enough. The passage cited by Professor Kittredge⁵ from Deschamps's *balade* No. 977⁶ is a clear case in point:

J'ay demouré entre les Sarrasins,
Esclave esté en pays de Surie.

Indeed this whole *balade* is uncommonly pertinent—even to its use of the figure of the trap:

Prince, homme n'est, ne si foul ne si saige,
Se femme prant, qu'elle ne l'assouaige,
Et qui ne soit par son fait entrapé.⁷

Yet, granting all this, Chaucer's reference to Fryse seems to be still so explicit as to warrant

⁴ See especially the poetical epistle (*Oeuvres complètes de Eustache Deschamps*, VIII, 37-44) written (or purporting to be written) by two members of Deschamps's circle: Regnault d'Angennes (l. 75) and Robinet le Tirant (l. 77), and addressed to Messire Guillaume de Meleun on his wedding day (December 20, 1390). Chaucer's hesitancy in referring to marriage as "the cheyne of Sathanas" is not shared by Robinet:

J'enten par mariage enfer,
Quant au corps, car homme de fer
Y est ars, rostiz et brulez
Et par male femme crulez,
Comme paille mis au neant (ll. 103-107).

The "ful hard is to be bonde" is there too:

Et je vous moustreray comment
Vous estes sers dolentement
A femme, quant vous lui jurez
Que jamais ne la changerez
Ne pour pieur ne pour milleur.
Helas! vez ci dure douleur,
Et qui pis est, tele espousaille
Est un droit gage de bataille
Dont l'un des deux couvient mourir
Ains qu'om s'en puisse departir (ll. 123-132).

The list of "sorwes and woes," however, is too long to be given in full. For example:

S'il veult du dur, il a du moul;
S'il veult des pois, il a du choul (ll. 153-54).
S'il parle bas, sa femme huye;
S'il rit, lors sa femme plourra (ll. 190-91)—and so on.

⁵ In the article referred to, p. 15, col. 1, near foot.

⁶ Vol. v, 217.

⁷ Ll. 31-33.

the conclusion that he is giving to a familiar commonplace a fresh turn, on the suggestion of a particular historical event.

But what if the reference to Fryse be itself a commonplace? There are two passages—one quite recently made accessible, the other long in print—which indicate that Friesland and the Frieslanders enjoyed in fourteenth century literature a certain proverbial notoriety. In Froissart's *La Prison Amoureuse* occur the following lines:

. . . les ors villains de Frise,
Es quels n'a point de gentillece,
D'onneur, de bien, ne de noblece,
Et vivent ensi comme bestes.
Tant ont lourdes et sotes testes!⁸

Even more striking is a passage from Machaut, in which a return from Friesland and its "ors villains" is described in no uncertain terms:

Douceur, charité ne confort
Ne truis en homme de l'eglise;
N'i a celui qui me confort,
Nè[s] que se j'estoie de Frise
Venus tous nus en ma chemise,
Querans mon pain de jour en jour.⁹

What could more aptly describe (one might ask) the condition in which (on the current assumption) one of William of Hainault's men might be supposed to have returned from the expedition of 1396? Yet Machaut was dead nearly twenty years before that expedition took place, and Froissart's lines antedated it by just a quarter of a century. Since, then, the characteristics of the Frisians implied in the phrase of the *Envoy* had been the subject of remark in verse almost from the time when Chaucer himself began to write, it is scarcely safe to assert that the lines in the *Envoy* contain a necessary reference to the particular events of 1396.¹⁰

⁸ Ll. 825-29, Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. Scheler, I, 239. The date of *La Prison Amoureuse* is 1371. See ll. 2252-53 (I, 288).

⁹ Machaut, *Poésies lyriques*, ed. Chichmaref, I, 234 (cclxi).

¹⁰ Watriquet de Couvin's "une oe de Frise" (*Oeuvres*, p. 308, *Fastrasie*, l. 382) looks like something of the same sort as is indicated in the other passages. There

But after giving this necessary caution its due weight, it still seems probable that the line *was* suggested by the expedition of William of Hainault. Only, instead of declaring with Professor Tatlock that "the poem cannot have been written before October, 1396,"¹¹ I should put it precisely the other way, and say that the poem very probably *was* written before October, 1396. In other words, it was the *preparations* for the expedition which gave the allusion pertinence, whereas the *outcome* of the expedition, in point of fact, left it with little relevance. A brief consideration of the facts, I think, will make this clear.

In 1395 Henry of Hungary sent to the King of France an embassy, informing him of the threat of the Great Turk to invade Henry's realm, as well as of his boast that he would go to Rome and make his horse eat oats on the high altar of St. Peter's. The embassy was commissioned to secure the aid of France.¹² As a result, John of Burgoyne was placed at the head of a body of a thousand knights and squires, which was to come to the aid of Hungary—and later (as we know) to meet disaster at Nicopolis.

Now it happened that John of Burgoyne was married to the daughter of Duke Albert of Bavaria, Earl of Hainault, Holland and Zeeland,¹³ and that news of the expedition came to William of Hainault, Albert's son. William thereupon urged his father to let him join his brother-in-law's forces. Albert, however, had his own plans, which included the conquest of

Friesland, and William's warlike energy was skillfully diverted from Hungary and the Turk to his own stubborn inheritance in the North. But such an expedition likewise demanded aid. Accordingly, ambassadors were sent to England to get men of arms and archers, and especially to induce the Earl of Derby to join his cousin's forces.¹⁴ John of Gaunt, however, declined to give his consent, and the Earl of Derby remained at home. The king, on the other hand, gathered together in the Thames a number of vessels for William's aid, to sail to Enkhuizen in Holland. It is therefore clear that the contemplated expedition into Friesland was well known in England for months before the actual start was made.

But we can go farther still. For from the reasons urged by the Duke of Guelderland to John of Gaunt against the Earl of Derby's participation in the expedition it is easy to see how the enterprise was regarded: "He [the Duke of Guelderland] answered and sayd, that it was a parylous voyage, and that Frese was a countrey nat lyghtly to be wonne; sayenge, howe in tymes past there had been dyvers erles of Holande and Heynalte that have claymed their right there, and gone thyder to have put them in subiectyon, but they have always loste their lyves there, *affyrmyng* howe the *Fresons* are people without honour, and have no mercy; they prayse nor love no lorde in the worlde, they be so proude; and also their country is stronge," etc.¹⁵ Even that, however, is not all. For Froissart rehearses with the utmost explicitness the general apprehension which the expedition aroused: "Nowe whyle this assemble was thus made in Haynalte, it were to be demaunded if the ladyes and gentlewomen and other were joyouse of this journey. We oughte to say naye, for than they sawe their fathers, their bretherne, their uncles, their husbandes, and their lovers and frendes departe to that peryllous warre: for some of them knewe well howe that in tyme paste the Haynowayes wente with their lorde into Frese, and never retourned agayne; wherfore they feared leste it shulde

seems, moreover, to be some indication that Frise was regarded as more or less of a jumping-off place:

Si n'ot plus bele *jusqu'en Frise*
Fors la bele Leryopé

(Robert of Blois, ed. Ulrich, II, 18);

N'est pas dous tex maus
Jusqu'en Frise

N'a si fort justice

(Gillebert de Bernville, in Dinaux, *Trouvères*, II, 194).

¹¹ P. 211. Skeat says (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 85) "during or just after the expedition."

¹² Froissart, *Chronicles*, Vol. II, chap. cciii. I am using Lord Berners's translation (in the *Tudor Translations*), as I have not at present access to the original.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Chap. ccix.

¹⁵ Chap. ccix.

hap so than to these as it dyd on their predecessours."¹⁶ That is to say, it was the fate of earlier expeditions which disturbed, at this particular juncture of affairs, the minds of those who were interested in *this* expedition, and an allusion to being "take in Fryse," which might have been made at any time during the previous decade or so, would undoubtedly have peculiar pertinence at just this time.

But it would *not* have had the same pertinence, if indeed it would have had any, after the expedition itself. For by William of Hainault's campaign the old order was decidedly reversed. Even the Frieslanders themselves had understood the situation better. Juye Jouer, their leader, called by some "the great Fresone" from his enormous height, began his address to his men as follows: "O, ye noble and free Fresons, knowe for trouthe there is no chaunce but may tourne. Though by your valyantesse ye have or this tyme disconfyted the Henowayes, the Hallanders, and the Zelanders, knowe for trouthe, that suche as come now upon you, are people more experte in the warre thanne they were before, and beleve verily, they shall do otherwise than their predecessours dyde; they wyll not gyve it up, they wyll menteyne their dedes."¹⁷ And his forebodings were justified by the event. It was precisely William of Hainault's expedition which went far to lay the fear of being "take in Fryse" which had haunted during the previous decades the minds of all who had to do with Friesland. And Chaucer's line, pertinent at any time during these previous decades, but peculiarly relevant during the year preceding August, 1396, would have had little or no point at any time *after* the expedition.

Finally, the one *certainly* in the case is the fact that the *Envoy* followed the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*.¹⁸ If the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* was written during 1393 or early in 1394, as I have recently shown reason to believe,¹⁹ then the

Envoy must be dated after the middle or end of 1393. If further the Robert Bukton whose wife is mentioned in a grant of March 14, 1397²⁰ is the Bukton of the *Envoy*, then the *Envoy* belongs somewhere between the middle of 1393 and the beginning of 1397. If the facts which I have just pointed out have any weight, the line about the danger of being "take in Fryse" might have been written at any time within these limits. It is quite possible, I should say even probable, that it was the expedition of August and September, 1396, which suggested the allusion. But in that case it was the state of mind which accompanied the *preparations* for the expedition, rather than the outcome of the campaign itself, which gave the allusion point. Even on the orthodox assumption, then, the poem should be placed *before* rather than *after* August, 1396.

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.

Washington University.

THE USE OF THE FRENCH PAST DEFINITE IN *SI*-CLAUSES

The use of the French past definite in *si*-clauses seems scarcely touched upon in treatises on French Grammar. In looking through more than forty such works in English, French and German, including Brunot, Darmesteter, Meyer-Lübke, Tobler and many others, I have found only four references to the subject. E. Etienne, in his *Essai de grammaire de l'ancien français*, p. 298, among a list of conditions in which "la chose est considérée comme non douteuse," gives one example of the p. def. Professor E. C. Armstrong, *Syntax of the French Verb*, under the heading: "*Si* clauses equivalent to declarative statements," says: "In them, the verb may be in the past definite, the future, the conditional, or their compounds.¹ None of them can be

¹⁶ Chap. cexi.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ The Wyf of Bathe I pray you that ye rede Of this matere that we have on honde (ll. 29-30).

¹⁹ *Modern Philology*, VIII, 327 ff.

²⁰ See Tatlock, 211, n. Professor Tatlock's identification, however, does not seem to me to be convincing.

¹ I have not noted any instances of the past anterior.

used in other *si* clauses." Mätzner, in his *Frz. Gram.*, p. 343, ed. of 1885, says: "Im Bedingungssatze steht das Perfektum definitum, wenn ohne Entscheidung ein Faktum gesetzt wird. . . . Dabei kann sich die Voraussetzung der Wahrheit der Tatsache stattfinden." Professor J. A. Harrison, in his *French Syntax*, based on Mätzner, has the same statement, p. 146. This statement is the only one that I have found that recognizes that the *p. def.* is used in conditional clauses in cases of both fact and doubt. (It is never used in contrary-to-fact clauses, so far as I have noticed.) In view of the scarcity of the material available on this subject and of the few examples given, it may be worth while to cite other examples and to attempt to draw some deductions from them.

I have made no search in Old French, but the construction existed. Etienne gives one example, and H. Johanssen, *Der Ausdruck des Concessivverhältnisses im Altfrz.*, p. 54, gives 8. In all of these, the verb of the *si*-clause states a concessive fact. In modern French, if we leave out of consideration the still fairly common expression *S'il en fut (jamais)*, the first and most obvious point in regard to this construction is that it is rare. In several years' reading, of tolerably various character, I have noted only 68 instances, gathered, among other authors, from Rabelais, Monluc, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Pascal, Bossuet, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Töpffer, Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, France and Rostand. To these should be added 1 from Mätzner, and 5 kindly furnished me by Professor E. C. Armstrong. Of this total of 74 cases, 4 are from the 16th century, 20 from the 17th, 11 from the 18th, 29 from the 19th, and 10 from the 20th; of the last 39, 24 are before 1860 and 15 after 1860.

So far as an inference is justifiable from this limited number of cases, it would appear that, in modern French, the construction is relatively commonest in the seventeenth century, and that it has become much more rare in the nineteenth and twentieth.² This last conclusion is strengthened by the negative evi-

dence that one may read many thousands of pages of contemporary French without meeting a single instance. In conditional clauses, as in other uses, the *p. def.* has been largely supplanted by the past indefinite and the imperfect,—generally in cases of fact, almost always in cases of doubt.

The use of the *p. def.* in the latter case seems always to have been rare, which doubtless accounts for the fact that this use has been almost uniformly ignored by grammars. I have found altogether only ten cases, less than one-seventh of the total number, which are given here:

"Sa [Julie's] faute, si c'en fut une, n'a servi qu'à déployer sa force et son courage." Rousseau, *Nouvelle Héloïse*, 5^e Partie, Lettre 2 (1761).—"Si jamais la vanité fit quelque heureux sur la terre, à coup sûr cet heureux-là n'était qu'un sot." *Ib.*, 5^e Partie, Lettre 3, note q.—"Mais si aux glaces de l'âge vous avez laissé s'unir l'égoïsme . . . ; si de tout temps vous sûtes calculer le présent pour l'avenir; . . . alors vous blâmez celui qui renonce à un héritage." Töpffer, *L'Héritage*, iv (1839).—"Si cet acte fut commis pour éviter l'effusion du sang, . . . il faut le plaindre. S'il fut toléré par ambition personnelle, il faut le flétrir." Lamartine (Mätzner).—"Si l'on eut cette idée, les royalistes avaient intérêt à la prévenir." Michelet, *Histoire de la Révolution française*, p. 107 of Wright's *Extraits* (1847-1853).—"Ce qui est certain, c'est que s'il le put, il y assista." Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, i, p. 506 (1840).—"M. de Pontchâteau . . . se sera exagéré le tort (si même il en eut) du bon Fontaine." *Ib.*, ii, 244, note 2.—"Puissances de l'ombre . . . si, vous attardant chez moi après le chant du coq, vous me vîtes alors glisser sur la pointe des pieds dans la cité des livres, vous ne vous écriâtes certainement pas" etc. France, *Sylvestre Bonnard*, p. 234, Holt ed. (1881).—"Il ne me paraît pas possible qu'on puisse avoir l'esprit tout à fait commun, si l'on fut élevé sur les quais de Paris." France, *le Livre de mon ami*, p. 79, Holt ed. (1885).—"S'il y eut réellement une loi, elle fut donc portée, ou tout au moins renouvelée, par la démocratie." Croiset, *Hist. de la littérature grecque*, T. III, p. 393 (1899).

It will be noted that the earliest of these cases is of 1761, and that only three of them are of the last sixty years.

In two instances the condition has mixed tenses, once the *p. def.* and the past indefinite

² The 19th century cases quoted represent much more reading than those of the preceding three centuries combined. 15 of the 29 cases are from two authors.

(quoted above), once the p. def. and the imperfect: "S'il [Mithridates] avait l'art de solliciter les peuples . . . il éprouvait à son tour des perfidies de la part de ses capitaines . . . ; enfin s'il eut affaire à des généraux romains malhabiles, on envoya contre lui, en divers temps, Sylla, Lucullus et Pompée." Montesquieu, *Grandeur et décadence des Romains*, ch. vii. (1734).—In fourteen instances the verb of the *si*-clause is modified by *jamais*, in ten by other temporal adverbs.—The conclusions show much variety as to tense, mood and construction; they are more often in the p. def. (more than one-third of all cases) than in any other tense.³

While wider reading would doubtless modify the above deductions in some particulars, two conclusions seem reasonably safe; that the construction is rare and increasingly so; and that the cases of fact are much more numerous than the cases of doubt.

Appended are some additional examples:

"Si je fis ice, si est felunie es meies mains." *Psaut. d'Ox.*, 7, 3 (12th cent., quoted in Etienne, *loc. cit.*).—"Et sē ele fu en paine de l'entrer, encor fu ele en forceur de l'iscir." *Aucassin et Nicolette*, xvi, 22 (12th cent.).—"Se li rois en fu lies, puis en ot marrement." Renaud de Montauban, 45, 24.—"Je jure devant toy, [Dieu]—ainsi me soys tu favorable, si jamais à luy [Picrochole] desplaisir, ne à ses gens dommaige, ne en ses terres je feis pillerie; mais, bien au contraire, je l'ay secouru de gens, d'argent," etc. Rabelais, Livre 1, *Gargantua*, ch. 28 (1535).—Luy sans parole dire Entr'ouvrit doucement un delicat sourire, . . . et promptement je meure, Si ce ris delicat ne m'attendrit le coeur, Me faisant oublier la colere et la peur. R. Belleau, *Premiere journee de la Bergerie* (1565).—Par ces vers j'en prens acte affin que l'avenir De moy, par ta [Rapin's] vertu, se puisse souvenir; Et que ceste memoire à jamais s'entretienne, Que ma Muse imparfaite eut en honneur la tienne; Et que si j'eus l'esprit d'ignorance abatu, Je l'euz au moins si bon, que j'aimay ta vertu. Régnier, *Satire ix* (1608).—Alcippe: "Continue, et fais bien l'ignorante." Clarice: "Si je le vis jamais, et si je le connoi!" Corneille, *le Menteur*, 498-499 (1643-1644).—

³ Since the above was written I have noted the following Old French example:

Desor le pont en a .j. encontre,
Tel li dona qu'il l'abat el fossé;
Se il ot soif, boire pot a plenté.

(*Aymeri de Narbonne*, 925-927.)

Mais si elle eut de la joie de régner sur une grande nation, c'est parce qu'elle pouvait contenter le désir immense, qui sans cesse la sollicitait à faire du bien. Bossuet, *Oraison funèbre de Henriette-Marie de France*, 4 pp. from beginning (1669).—Vénus: "Mon fils, si j'eus jamais sur toi quelque crédit, Et si jamais je te fus chère, . . . Emploie, emploie ici l'effort de ta puissance." Molière, *Psyché*, Prologue (1671).—Mais tous ils confessaient que si jamais les Dieux Ne mirent sur le trône un roi plus glorieux, Également comblé de leurs faveurs secrètes, Jamais père ne fut plus heureux que vous l'êtes. Racine, *Iphigénie*, 355-358, (1674).—S'il eut beaucoup de bonne volonté, j'eus aussi pour lui une très forte attache. Boileau, *le Lutrin*, Avis au lecteur (1683 and 1701).—Angélique (disguised as man): "Si jamais je vous fus cher, Madame, il est temps de vous déclarer." Dancourt, *la Folle Enchère*, sc. xxii (1690).—Car s'il n'y eut jamais amour tel que le vôtre, il est impossible aussi d'être aimé plus tendrement que vous l'êtes. Prévost, *Manon Lescaut*, T. II, p. 123, ed. of 1745 (1731).—Si jamais il y eut quelqu'un d'étonné, ce furent les gens qui entendirent ces mots. Voltaire, *Zadig*, ch. vi (1747).—Tout ce qui dépend de ma volonté fut pour mon devoir. Si le coeur, qui n'en dépend pas, fut pour vous, ce fut mon tourment et non pas mon crime. Rousseau, *la Nouvelle Héloïse*, Livre vi, 12 (1761).—Si, vainqueurs de Toulon, vous présageâtes l'immortelle campagne de 93, vos victoires actuelles en présagent une plus belle encore. Bonaparte, *Proclamation à l'armée d'Italie* (1796).—Dieu lui-même, en douant ce regard de candeur, S'il y mit plus de flamme, y mit plus de pudeur. Hugo, *Marion de Lorme*, A. v, sc. iii (1829).—A Marathon, . . . les Athéniens . . . s'ils arrêtaient l'armée barbare, ne purent l'empêcher de s'embarquer. France, *Mannequin d'osier* (1897, p. 63 of Dike's *Monsieur Bergeret*).—Cyrano: "Si quelquefois je fus éloquent . . ." Roxanne: "Vous le fûtes!" Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, A. III, sc. vi (1897).—Même si elle ne fut pas ce qu'elle aurait dû être, vous devriez la bénir et la remercier, cette jeunesse. Lavedan, *Le bon temps*, p. 355 (1906).—Si'ils n'en obtinrent pas la suppression, ils le réduisirent à l'effacement. Lavis, *Histoire de France*, ix, I, p. 18 (1910).⁴

GEO. N. HENNING.

George Washington University.

⁴ I owe to one of my graduate students, Mr. Edward Cullom, several of the 17th century quotations in this article and to Professor Armstrong several instances of the p. def. construction later than any I had noted.

TWO DEBTS OF SCOTT TO *LE MORTE D'ARTHUR*

There are two passages in *Ivanhoe* which seem to be founded on two incidents related in *Le Morte D'Arthur*. It is, of course, well known that Scott was widely read in the literature of chivalry. He was an ardent admirer of *Le Morte D'Arthur*, as appears from two letters to Southey in 1807,¹ and even meditated an edition of the book, a project which he dropped on learning of Southey's like intention. In the earlier of the two letters which I have mentioned, Scott says that he possessed the 1637² edition of the romance.

The first passage in *Ivanhoe* which seems derived from Malory's romance is a part of the tournament incident.³ The Ninth Book of *Le Morte D'Arthur*, chapter twenty-six to chapter thirty-five,⁴ contains what are apparently the sources of many of the details connected with certain of the participants and their conduct in Scott's tournament of Ashby de la Zouche. In chapter twenty-six Sir Tristram of Lyonesse is on his way to the Castle of Maidens where a tournament has been proclaimed by King Carados of Scotland and the King of North Wales. There is some jousting before the tournament begins and in it Sir Tristram takes part. In chapter thirty he provides himself with a black shield "with none other remembraunce therin," and so equipped takes part in the tourney. He is successful in his tilting and is adjudged the winner of the day under the title of "the Knyght with the black sheld," for although some are certain that he is Sir Tristram and some merely suspect his identity, yet no one absolutely penetrates his disguise and makes him known. Sir Tristram has allied himself with the weaker party—that opposing King Arthur's and Sir Launcelot's,

"where the most noble knyghts of the world ben."⁵ It should be noticed, too, that he withdraws secretly from the field at the end of each day. The prize for the last day's jousting is awarded to Sir Launcelot, who resigns it to Sir Tristram. The latter, who has left the field, cannot be found, however.

In Scott's novel Sir Wilfred of Ivanhoe is leading one of the parties on the second day of the tournament at Ashby. The opposing party, that of Prince John's followers, is perhaps the stronger. During the early part of the jousting King Richard, who has just returned from his Austrian prison, and who, disguised, is taking part in the tournament, keeps near the edge of the lists. His accouterments and even his horse are black. At the moment when Sir Wilfred is in great danger of being overthrown by Front-de-Boeuf and Sir Athelstone of Coningsburgh Richard comes to the rescue, beats down the assailants, and then retires. Soon afterward Prince John ends the tournament by casting down his truncheon. The prize for the day is given to the party of Ivanhoe and the individual honors to Richard. He is nowhere to be found, however, when the honors are to be given and some of the spectators report his having retired from the lists into a near-by wood.

Some points of resemblance are plainly visible in comparing the synopses given in the preceding paragraphs. Others must be got from the reading and the comparing of the two incidents which I have considered. The points falling to the former class are as follows: the use of plain black armor by the King and Sir Tristram as a disguise; each one's attaching himself to what is apparently the weaker party; each one's retiring privately from the field at the end of the day's fighting and allowing the prize to go to another. The two men are given descriptive nicknames which are somewhat similar—The Knight with the Black Shield and Le Noir Faineant. It is suspected that the unknown knight in Malory's tournament is Sir Tristram; Richard is not recognized or even suspected. Sir Wilfred, who is also unknown, is, however, in the course of the first day's jousting, suspected of being Coeur de Lion. Indeed, the

¹ November, 1807; December 15, 1807. *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott*, by John Gibson Lockhart. Edinburgh, 1862. Vol. III, pp. 31, 35.

² Probably 1634, as there is no mention of a 1637 edition.

³ Chapters VIII, IX, X, XI, XIII. (The last chapter mentioned contains most of the material for my comparison.) The Border Edition, London and New York, 1906.

⁴ *Le Morte D'Arthur*, by Sir Thomas Malory . . . Edited by H. Oskar Sommer, Ph. D. London, 1889, pp. 378-396.

⁵ Chapter XXXI.

deeds of Sir Tristram at the Castle of Maidens seem to a certain extent to be divided between *Ivanhoe* and the King.

The second incident to which I wish to call attention is found in chapter forty-four of *Ivanhoe*, and the passage which it calls to mind in *Le Morte D'Arthur* is chapter six, book eighteen. Queen Guenevere is to be burned for "treason"—the poisoning of Sir Patrise at a feast—unless some knight will do battle for her against her accuser, Sir Mador de la Porte, and overcome him. Sir Launcelot, her usual champion, has been banished from court so that Sir Bors takes the Queen's part with the provision that he withdraw if a better knight come to take his place. The court assembles in the meadows near Westminster. The stake is ready and the two knights, Bors and Mador, withdraw to the opposite ends of the lists. At this point a knight in strange armor appears and volunteers to defend the Queen. Sir Bors withdraws in his favor, and the new champion and Sir Mador fight, with the result that the latter is badly wounded and forced to yield and to retract the charges which he has made against Guenevere. The stranger proves to be Sir Launcelot, who has taken this opportunity of righting himself at court.

In *Ivanhoe* the Jewess, Rebecca, has been condemned to death by fire for sorcery, in a court of Knights Templars. The Templars are assembled in the tiltyard at Templestowe. The stake and faggots are ready. Rebecca's accuser, Sir Brian de Bois-Guilbert, is waiting fully armed to prove his charges on anyone who may champion the young woman's cause. Just as her guilt is about to be declared established because of the absence of any defender, Sir Wilfred appears to do battle as Rebecca's champion. After some parleying the two knights charge each other. Very luckily for the nearly-disabled *Ivanhoe*, Sir Brian dies of some sort of stroke before the combat has really begun. As a result, the Jewess is freed, as the charge of sorcery is considered disproved.

These passages are, it is true, not alike to a remarkable degree, yet the germ of Scott's can be seen, it seems plain, in the chapter of *Le Morte D'Arthur* which has been summarized. The method of punishment, the lack of a defender and the scarcity of friends, the opportune arrival of a champion, and the outcome of the combat,—

these all point toward a relation between the two incidents. The ease with which *Ivanhoe* obtains his victory is due to the exigencies of Scott's story, of course, and is, therefore, an unimportant variation. Taking it and the other differences between the stories in both of the cases which I have cited, and considering them together with the parallels which have been brought out, one can, I believe, hardly escape admitting the existence of a certain relationship between those particular parts of *Ivanhoe* and of *Le Morte D'Arthur*.

R. S. FORSYTHE.

University of Kansas.

NOTE SUR *LE POUR ET LE CONTRE* DE VOLTAIRE

*Le Pour et le Contre*¹ est le titre donné en 1775 au poème intitulé jusqu'à cette date *Épître à Uranie*,² "argumentation rigoureuse contre la religion révélée"³ que Voltaire conclut par l'apologie de la "religion naturelle."—Il ne semble pas que l'*Épître à Uranie* ait été imprimée avant 1738,⁴ mais il est hors de doute qu'elle a été composée au plus tard en 1731⁵ et qu'elle courut à Paris en 1732.⁶

On identifie d'ordinaire l'*Épître à Uranie* avec une *Épître à Julie* qui serait perdue, mais que Voltaire aurait lue à Jean-Baptiste Rousseau en septembre 1722, lorsqu'il le rencontra à Bruxelles.⁷—Quelles preuves a-t-on de l'ex-

¹ *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, éd. Moland, ix, pp. 358-362.

² *Id.*, p. 358, n.; cf. Georges Bengesco, *Voltaire, Bibliographie de ses œuvres*, Paris, 1882-1885, I, pp. 160-161.

³ G. Lanson, *Voltaire*² (les Grands Écrivains Français), Paris, 1910, p. 33.

⁴ G. Bengesco, *l. l.*; v. pourtant G. Desnoiresterres, *La Jeunesse de Voltaire*,² Paris, 1871, pp. 459-460.

⁵ *Œuv. Volt.*, xxxiii, p. 215 (lettre à Thieriot, du 30 juin 1731).

⁶ *Œuv. Volt.*, ix, p. 358, n.; G. Bengesco, *l. l.*; cf. Desnoiresterres, *l. l.*

⁷ *Id.*; *ibid.*; *ibid.*—M. Lanson, *l. l.*, a douté de cette identification: "il n'est pas sûr qu'il (Voltaire) écrivit ainsi en 1722," mais déjà il "pensait ainsi."

istence d'une *Épître à Julie*? La *Correspondance* de Voltaire n'y fait aucune allusion⁸ et la lettre écrite par Rousseau le 20 septembre 1722 à M. Boutet le fils⁹ exprime simplement le charme qu'il trouva à passer onze jours presque sans quitter Voltaire et à admirer sa *Ligue*. C'est seulement dans la lettre de Rousseau à M. N * * *, du 22 mai 1736,¹⁰ qu'il est fait mention de cette *Épître à Julie* "marquée au coin de l'impiété la plus noire": cette lettre étant postérieure au scandale que l'*Épître à Uranie* causa en 1732¹¹ et Voltaire étant alors en guerre ouverte avec Rousseau, la contradiction flagrante entre les deux récits de la rencontre à Bruxelles permet d'estimer que Rousseau a pu dénaturer en 1736 la vérité de 1722 et prêter à Voltaire une "impiété" précoce.¹²

S'il n'y a pas de preuves extérieures certaines en faveur de l'existence d'une *Épître à Julie* en 1722, on peut, ce semble, discerner que la philosophie de l'*Épître à Uranie* n'est exposée par Voltaire qu'à partir de 1728 au plus tôt. En effet, on lit dans l'*Épître à Uranie* que Dieu "demande compte à cent peuples divers" de l'"erreur d'un premier père:"

⁸ *Œuv.*, XXXIII, p. 73, n. 2 (lettre à Thieriot, de La Haye, 2 octobre 1722): Moland voit une allusion possible à l'*Épître à Uranie* dans ce passage: "Je viens d'achever un ouvrage d'un autre genre, que je vous montrerai à mon retour, et dont je ne peux vous rien dire à présent"; l'indication est beaucoup trop vague, à mon sens;—de même, p. 75, n. 1: "Ne dites de mes vers à personne" (lettre à Thieriot, de La Haye, 8 octobre 1722) (l'éditeur ne remarque pas que Voltaire, si l'on en croit sa lettre du 2 octobre, n'a pas envoyé ses vers à Thieriot).

⁹ *Œuvres de J. B. Rousseau*, Paris, Lefèvre, 1820, v, pp. 44-46.

¹⁰ *Id.*, *ibid.*, pp. 208-209.

¹¹ Cf. n. 6.

¹² Sur la guerre entre Voltaire et Rousseau, v. *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, ix, pp. 562 sqq.—La lettre de 1736 est mensongère sur d'autres points: cf. Desnoiresterres, p. 235.—Rousseau indique (même lettre, p. 212) que Voltaire a converti les blasphèmes de l'*Épître à Julie* en blasphèmes moins horribles dans l'*Épître à Uranie*: il suffit de comparer certains passages de la *Henriade* (p. ex., *Œuvres*, viii, p. 116) aux passages correspondants de la *Ligue* (*id.*, p. 130) pour voir que ce n'est pas là l'ordinaire progression de l'impiété voltairienne.

Il punit au fond des enfers
L'ignorance invincible où lui-même il les plonge,
Lui qui veut éclairer et sauver l'univers!

Amérique, vastes contrées,
Peuples que Dieu fit naître aux portes du soleil,
Vous, nations hyperborées,
Que l'erreur entretient dans un si long sommeil,
Serez-vous pour jamais à sa fureur livrées

Pour n'avoir pas su qu'autrefois,
Dans un autre hémisphère, au fond de la Syrie,
Le fils d'un charpentier, enfanté par Marie,
Renié par Céphas, expira sur la croix?

• • • • •
• • • • •
• • • • •
• • • • •
Songe que du Très-Haut la sagesse éternelle
A gravé de sa main dans le fond de ton cœur
La religion naturelle;
Crois que de ton esprit la naïve candeur
Ne sera point l'objet de sa haine immortelle;
Crois que devant son trône, en tout temps, en tous lieux,

Le cœur du juste est précieux;
Crois qu'un bonze modeste, un dervis charitable,
Trouvent plutôt grâce à ses yeux
Qu'un janséniste impitoyable
Ou qu'un pontife ambitieux.¹³

—D'autre part, on trouve les mêmes idées, le même développement et souvent les mêmes expressions dans la *Henriade*:¹⁴ auprès de Dieu, "juge incorruptible," la Mort conduit les habitants de ce triste univers, Chinois, Persans, et

Les pâles habitants de ces froides contrées
Qu'assiègent de glaçons les mers hyperborées;
Ceux qui de l'Amérique habitent les forêts,
De l'erreur invincible innombrables sujets.
Le dervis étonné, d'une vue inquiète,
A la droite de Dieu cherche en vain son prophète.
Le bonze, avec des yeux sombres et pénitents,
Y vient vanter en vain ses vœux et ses tourments.

• • • • •
• • • • •
"Quelle est, disait Henri, s'interrogeant lui-même,
Quelle est de Dieu sur eux la justice suprême?
Ce Dieu les punit-il d'avoir fermé leurs yeux
Aux clartés que lui-même il plaça si loin d'eux?"

Pourrait-il les juger, tel qu'un injuste maître,
Sur la loi des chrétiens, qu'ils n'avaient pu connaître?
Non. Dieu nous a créés, Dieu nous veut sauver tous:
Partout il nous instruit, partout il parle à nous;

¹³ *Œuv.*, ix, pp. 360-362.

¹⁴ Chant vii: *Œuv.*, viii, pp. 171-172.

*Il grave en tous les cœurs la loi de la nature,
Seule à jamais la même, et seule toujours pure.
Sur cette loi, sans doute, il juge les païens,
Et si leur cœur fut juste, ils ont été chrétiens."*

Il me paraît vraisemblable que ces deux passages représentent deux états de pensée contemporains.¹⁵ Or, ce texte de la *Henriade* n'apparaît que dans l'édition de 1730. L'édition de 1728 ignore la mention de l'Amérique et des nations hyperborées, la loi de la nature "gravée par Dieu dans les cœurs," le "cœur juste";¹⁶ dans la *Ligue*, de 1723, Dieu séparait seulement l'innocent du coupable: nulle allusion n'était faite à la diversité des religions ni à la loi de nature.¹⁷

Peut-on croire, dès lors, que Voltaire ait écrit en 1722 une *Épître à Julie* où il aurait exprimé (avec une gravité absente de son œuvre jusqu'au jour où il revient d'Angleterre) des idées qu'on voit s'affirmer chez lui après 1728 seulement? Je croirais plutôt que l'*Épître à Julie* est une invention de J. B. Rousseau.

A. TERRACHER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

*La Phonétique Castillane.*¹ Traité de phonétique descriptive et comparative par MOLTON AVERY COLTON. Paris, 1909. 8vo., 199 pp.

We have here, for the second time in four years, a work on Spanish phonetics by an American teacher. Both books are written in French, but in other respects they differ widely. Josselyn, in his *Études de Phonétique Espagnole* (1907), attempted to discover some of the elements common to the pronunciations of Andalusia, New

Castile, Old Castile, Leon, and Asturia, without, however, professing to write a complete treatise on the subject. Mr. Colton, on the other hand, confines himself to Old and New Castile, taking as his territory the country east and west of and along the railway line of Palencia, Valladolid, Madrid, and has written the most extensive study of Spanish phonetics so far published. Moreover, being a disciple of Paul Passy, Mr. Colton does not, like Mr. Josselyn, employ the experimental method. And, finally, the author of the present work bases his study on popular speech, while his predecessor chose the speech of the educated class. Mr. Colton states that "there is little difference between literary pronunciation and popular pronunciation, if in the two cases conversation be taken as the basis of observation" (p. 9). It is true that in Spain the difference between the speech of the common people and that of the "gente ilustrada" is much less marked than it is in France or in Germany, but it is hardly safe to assume that it is negligible. In consideration of all these elements, it is not surprising that the conclusions of the two authors often differ.

That the author is a novice, as he tells us himself (p. 5 and p. 81), may account for the freedom with which he criticizes the opinions of Baist (p. 81 and p. 179) and Jespersen (p. 190), the sharp attacks on the theories of Rousselot (p. 5), Vianna (p. 81) and Storm (p. 160), and the savage onslaughts on Araujo and Josselyn throughout the book. This is the one regrettable feature about a work which is, in other respects, deserving of high praise, for Mr. Colton is well informed in phonetic literature, he has an acute ear, he is a keen observer, his book contains many original ideas, and his discovery of metaphony in Castilian is, to say the least, noteworthy. He has the courage of his convictions, and whether one agrees with him or not, one can not help admiring his thoroughgoing honesty.

The author combats from first to last the doctrine that there are only five vowels in Castilian. This is his *cheval de bataille*. Without it, his book would be reduced by one-half. There must be more than five vowels, or else all of his theory of metaphony and much of what he says on vowel quantity will have to be abandoned. It is not surprising, therefore, that the last sentence in the

¹⁵ Il n'est pas impossible que le texte de l'*Épître*, plus agressif, à ce qu'il semble, soit un peu postérieur au texte de la *Henriade*.

¹⁶ *Œuv.*, VIII, pp. 191-192.—N'ayant à ma disposition aucune des éditions données par Voltaire, je m'en rapporte à l'édition de Moland.

¹⁷ *Id.*, p. 191.

¹ This book, in spite of the date on the title page, appeared in 1911. On sale with George W. Jones, 194 Main street, Annapolis, Md.

book is: "Y a-t-il donc lieu de s'étonner que le castillan ait aussi plus de cinq voyelles?"

Here, then, are the vowels that he sets down for Castilian (the order in parenthesis is, for the oral vowels, from close to open): two vowels represented in ordinary orthography by *a* (*a*, *a*); four by *o* (*o*, *o*, *o*, *o*); two by *u* (*u*, *u*); four by *e* (*e*, *e*, *e*, *e*); two by *i* (*i*, *i*); three "abnormal vowels" (*φ*, *œ*, *ϑ*); and six nasal vowels (*ā*, *ō*, *ū*, *ē*, *ī*, *ē*); twenty-three in all, or seven more than Passy finds for French. To one acquainted with French and with Castilian this result is certainly surprising, especially when we remember that Araujo, Vianna, and Josselyn agree that, setting aside shades of difference due to individual idiosyncrasies and to the influence of dialect, there are only five vowels in Spanish. Baist found seven vowels, but remarkt that since open *e* and close *e* assonate, as also open *o* and close *o*, the distance between the open and the close vowel in each case could not be very great. To the first three Mr. Colton gives *batlle royal*, while Baist is patronizingly quoted with partial approval.

There can be no question that more than five vowels may be heard in Castilian speech, but this fact is unimportant as long as it is not shown that the variations from certain norms appear regularly. This the author attempts to do, but he acknowledges that his lines of demarcation between vowels are "souvent arbitraires," for, he goes on to say, "il existe à peu près toutes les nuances d'un extrême à l'autre de ce qu'on a bien voulu appeler une voyelle, c'est-à-dire de *e* à *ε* et de *o* à *ο* etc." (p. 61). For him, moreover, "la voyelle type n'existe pas" (p. 101), yet he berates Araujo for choosing the French word *et* as indicating the type of Castilian *e*, "parce que ce n'est pas l'*e* fermé qui est le type du castillan, c'est-à-dire le plus commun" (p. 70), and on p. 24, he mentions "deux nuances de la variété *a*." Moreover, indefinite statements like the following occur: "[On dit] *kanto tanto*, mais *tanto kanto*, cependant, même dans ce cas, l'*a* peut résister à l'accent totalement ou en partie" (p. 29); and "Par l'influence de l'accent, tout *u* peut devenir *u*" (p. 37), not "devient *u*," but "peut devenir *u*," without further explanation. In spite of the existence of two *a*'s, corresponding to, tho not the same as, the two French *a*'s, he acknowledges

that the Castilians "n'arrivent pas à faire la distinction en français entre *a* et *a* comme dans *pâle*, *patte*" (p. 154). The explanation given on p. 152 does not explain, since it is applicable to other linguistic groups as well, and does not make clear why an Anglo-American does not have the same difficulty. And, finally, the statement that there are six *regular* (our italics) nasal vowels in Castilian (p. 45) rouses one to vigorous protest.

In connection with this discussion, the following question is perhaps pertinent: Would a Castilian whose vowel system was confined to the five typical vowels of Castilian, *i. e.*, the most commonly recurring pronunciations of *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, excite any further comment than that he spoke "muy claro"?

It would be unjust to dismiss Mr. Colton's presentation of Castilian vowels without acknowledging that he has made many valuable additions to our knowledge of those vowels; that in emphasizing the instability of Castilian pronunciation he has opened up a new field; that altho many of his statements will arouse protest, he has raised questions which, in the future, it will not be possible to ignore.

One of these questions is the subject of metaphony, for which Mr. Colton also uses the expression "vowel harmony" (*harmonie vocalique*). The word *metaphony*, in its French form *métaphonie*, was first used in 1893 by Victor Henry in the French edition of his Grammar of English and German, and given its English form the following year in the English edition of the same book. Henry used the word to designate the phenomenon usually called *umlaut*, not being satisfied with the word *mutation*, which seemed to him too vague. Mr. Colton applies the word to phenomena which are in principle the same as *umlaut*, but are much less markt than phenomena hitherto classified under this name.

We shall attempt to state the four laws of metaphony which are explained on pp. 50-56.

1. When an open syllable containing *e*, *i*, *o*, *u* is followed by a syllable containing *a* (not *a*), the vowel of the first syllable will be close, *i. e.*, *e* will be pronounced as close *e*, *i* as close *i*, and so on. Ex. *manteca* = *mante*: *ka*; *mina* = *mi*: *na*; *poca* = *po*: *ka*; *una* = *u*: *na*.

2. When an open syllable containing *i*, *u* is fol-

lowed by a syllable containing *o* (i. e., close *o*), the vowel of the first syllable will be close. Ex. *fino* = *fi·no*; *uno* = *u·no*.

3. When an open syllable containing *e*, *o* is followed by a syllable containing *o* (i. e. close *o*), the vowel of the first syllable will be close or approximately so. Ex. *eco* = *e·ko* or *er ko*; *bobo* = *bo·vo*; while *todo* = *to·do* (see below).

4. When any syllable containing *a* is followed by a syllable containing *o*, the vowel of the first syllable will be close. Ex. *cabo* = *ka·vo*; *campo* = *kampo*.

It is impossible to go into details. Suffice it to say that the author considers the first law "presque absolue"; the second "presque aussi absolue"; in the case of the third, "l'influence métaphonique est moins forte," and hence such exceptions as *todo*; and concerning the fourth law, he remarks that "elle n'est pas de taille à lutter contre un accent fort de groupe ou de phrase."

When we observe that all the examples given in the discussion on metaphony, with one exception (*dijéramos*, p. 52), are paroxytones, and when we remember that the author finds all final *a*'s and all final *o*'s to be close, we notice that these four laws of metaphony can be summed up into the statement that final *a* and final *o* tend to make the vowel of the penultimate syllable close. Since the final vowels of Spanish are *a*, *o*, and *e*, one naturally asks why *e* does not exert metaphonic influence. This question the author attempts to answer (p. 60), but his explanation is obscure.

The chapter on consonants offers a number of shrewd observations, such as the remarks on *d*, on *m* and *n*, on *r*. The explanation of the fall of *d* in the ending *-ado* (p. 139) is particularly good. The presentation of the fricatives, too, is worthy of mention. The description of the stages in the weakening of a consonant (p. 132) is excellent. On the other hand, one is surprised to see *s* dismissed in thirteen lines. What the author says is correct, but when one remembers that this consonant is one of the shibboleths by which a foreigner is most easily detected, one certainly expects a more detailed description than the remark: "La consonne *s* a une articulation assez éloignée des dents en castillan" (p. 124). The author does not seem to have heard of the doubts that have been expressed concerning the nature of Spanish

ch, but takes for granted that it is a compound sound, made up of *t* and the sound represented by English *sh*.² These omissions do not, however, detract seriously from the generally high character of this chapter.

The discussion of the quantity of vowels and consonants is perhaps the most valuable contribution of this book. There are exaggerations, but Mr. Colton is unquestionably right in insisting that the old theory about Castilian vowel quantity must be discarded. There are long vowels in Castilian, and some of them, as the author remarks, are extremely long. In the same chapter are found the remarks on diphthongization, which are not only very illuminating, but carry conviction as well. That Castilian is on the eve of breaking up some of its present vowels into diphthongs seems almost demonstrated, after one has read Mr. Colton's observations.

In conclusion, it may not be out of place to suggest some improvements for a second edition. The arrangement of the book would be greatly improved by numbering the paragraphs and by inserting definite cross-references. Such references as "plus loin," "déjà," "ci-dessus," "ci-dessous," "à la suite" are very unsatisfactory. Examples should be set off by different type. The number of examples should be increased. There are many paragraphs without examples, and others for which the examples are to be found elsewhere (pp. 31, 32, 35, 38, 44, 46, etc.). The omission of phonetic texts is a serious drawback. Besides detached words, one might surely expect at least some sentences in phonetic transcription, but we have been able to find only five (pp. 90, 136, 141, 187, 187), and of these the longest consists of only six words (p. 136).³

A. F. KUERSTEINER.

Indiana University.

² Cf. in this connection an article by Winifred Scripture on the sounds "ch" and "j," in the October number of the *Popular Science Monthly* of 1911. See also Roudet's *Eléments de phonétique*, Paris, 1910.

³ The following misprints and omissions should be noted: P. 38, l. 18, "ouverte" should be changed to "fermée"; p. 58, l. 11, insert "haute" after "position"; p. 122, l. 12, "influence"; p. 134, l. 9, "langue"; p. 137, l. 32, "Araujo"; p. 176, l. 35, insert "en" before "est."

Studien zur Germanischen Sagengeschichte von Dr. FRIEDRICH PANZER. I. *Beowulf*. München, Beck, 1910.

The reader of this imposing volume may well feel himself rewarded for his pains. Here, for the first time, he will find a careful enumeration and analysis of the various *märchen* related to *Beowulf*, followed by a discussion of the significance of such an analysis for the origin and development of the epic. The need for an investigation like this has long been recognized. That it was undertaken by Dr. Panzer is fortunate, since he has already devoted much time to the study of the relations between popular story and epic, particularly in connection with the Middle High German *Gudrun*.¹ Although his general critical method is very much the same as in that study, he here exhibits far more caution. The earlier essay failed to meet with universal approval, in so far as it attempted to establish a connection between the "*Goldner-märchen*" on the one hand, and the *Hilde-Gudrun* saga and various other medieval narratives on the other,—hypotheses largely, if not wholly, original with the author himself. The present volume, however, serves in large measure to support the suggestions of earlier scholars, rather than to advance new or original theories. Its general effect is in no wise revolutionary. But the belated Müllenhoffian will find little comfort in the book. Apart from its main thesis, it deals, not the first, but one of the severest blows to the "mythological" theory, and to the derivation of the framework of the poem from the much-discussed *Beowa* of the charters and genealogies.

For the basic tale underlying the epic, Dr. Panzer retains the name "Bear's Son," already used by French and German scholars. Although the hero is not by any means always of animal parentage, he is always endowed with supernatural powers, which this title may serve to indicate. The main part of the typical *märchen* is as follows:—The hero engages in a desperate fight with one or more demonic

beings, whom he has sought out in a subterranean dwelling. As a result of this combat he frees several damsels kept in confinement by the monsters, and restores them to the upper world, but is himself compelled to remain in the demon realm, having been betrayed by faithless companions. At length he finds means to return in disguise, and after punishing the traitors, he marries the most beautiful of the rescued ladies.—This story is introduced in various ways, which may be grouped into three classes. In the first of these (Introductory formula A), which tells of the hero's youth and his association with doughty companions, a demon against whom the hero alone can prevail makes an attack upon him and his band of followers in a lonely house, but ultimately escapes to the lower world. Thither he is followed by the hero,—and then the main part of the tale begins. The second formula (B) tells little of the hero's boyhood, but begins with the adventure against the demon, who, after a hard contest with the youngest of a family of royal princes, escapes, and is pursued into his lair. Formula C deals with the ladies whom the hero is later to meet in the subterranean realm. They had been carried off by a demon, whom the champion first meets in a lonely house in the woods. Here again others are of no avail, the hero alone successfully resists the monster. *Beowulf* represents the main story, preceded by Formula B.

More than half the book is devoted to a careful discussion of the different forms of this *märchen*. The titles of two hundred and two books containing stories of this type are listed and numbered, and as each episode in the narrative is discussed, reference is made to these books by means of the numerals which respectively designate them. This is no doubt the only feasible method; to give even a short outline of each tale would require a separate volume, and a bulky one at that, while the later synthesis of all these analyses would be far more difficult. There is a great deal in the early part of the book that may be safely omitted, even by the careful reader, although his attention can hardly fail to be arrested by the striking resemblances to *Beowulf*. Such a section as that

¹ *Hilde-Gudrun*, Halle, 1901.

entitled "The Demon in the House in the Woods" (pp. 74-95) is interesting reading. Striking, too, is the wide distribution and variety of the material. The author concludes (p. 245) that the *märchen*, not only in its elements, but in its structure, may ultimately be traced back to the Indo-Iranian period, and he believes that it is not a degenerate form of myth, but that the development has rather been in the reverse direction.

The general reader is advised to take the *märchen*-analysis for granted, and to begin with the second division of the book (pp. 249 ff.). Here the direct bearing of the preceding discussion upon *Beowulf* becomes evident. The author does not believe merely that the epic and the *märchen* have certain motives in common, but rather that the story of Beowulf's fight with Grendel is really the fairy-tale of Bear's Son "altered by the art of the scop into heroic saga." To this has been added the Fight with the Dragon, an independent popular story (*volks-sage*). In the *märchen*, the female monster, though a well-known figure, and the mother of the male demon, never journeys to the upper world for revenge upon her son's adversary. In an earlier form of the story, Beowulf must have followed the tracks of the wounded Grendel into the lower world, and there met and overcome the mother. The old theory that the second adventure is an imitation of the first, or an insertion by an interpolator, which was pretty generally disbelieved even before the appearance of Panzer's book, is contradicted by all the evidence from popular stories (p. 278). The fight with the dragon represents the fusion of two separate types, the "Thor-type," in which the hero defends land and people, and the "Fafnir-type," in which he is chiefly concerned with the winning of treasure (p. 309). As for the issue between Sievers and Olrik, Panzer regards the narrative of Frotho's dragon-fight as a late invention, but believes that it incorporates details of an old Danish song ultimately identical with the version in *Beowulf* (p. 313). The union of the two elements of the Beowulf-story, "*märchen und volks-sage*," took place possibly in Gautland but surely also in Denmark.

The sagas of Grettir and of Orm Storolfsson are in themselves independent, according to Panzer's view, but they show the application of the Bear's Son or Doughty-Hans *märchen* to historical personages, and their literary form was influenced by the literary form of the saga of Beowulf. The *märchen* has often got into literary shape in Iceland without being affected by *Beowulf*, as in the stories of Grim Helguson, Asmund Flagðagæfa, and other heroes (p. 390). Panzer's discussions of the sagas of Grettir and of Orm Storolfsson and of Böðvar Bjarki are all important and interesting, and marked, on the whole, by sound reasoning. We can here notice only the last of these. Panzer takes sharp issue with Olrik's contention that no connection really exists between the Bjarki-story and the Beowulf-story. Jónsson and Heusler had already dissented, and in 1909 the present writer published a reëxamination of the whole question, concluding that the Beowulf-story (not necessarily in its form in the Anglo-Saxon epic) had certainly exercised an influence upon the late *Hrólfs-saga*.² This discussion was evidently not accessible to Dr. Panzer. He believes the two stories identical at bottom, but is far from being dogmatic about the relationships and development of the different forms of the material. "I am not of the opinion," he says, "that I have made everything in the preceding discussion appear probable. I shall have to bear it as best I may, if people reckon some of these combinations among those exercises of the intellect which appear as tiresome to the reader as they were agreeable to their originator." The simplest solution of the problem would seem to be that we have to do with late influence of the Beowulf-story upon the *Hrólfs-saga* alone, but the exact truth about this complicated question may never, perhaps, be determined. It should always be remembered, in considering the relations between *Beowulf* and this later Scandinavian material, that we are dealing, in all probability, not with the Anglo-

² "Some Disputed Questions in Beowulf-Criticism," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxiv, 220 ff.

Saxon *Beowulf*, but with a form of the story which had developed and was circulating independently in the North.

The results of the whole study are summed up in the closing chapter (pp. 389-404). Dr. Panzer thinks that *Beowulf* may very likely have been an historical personage, distinguished for his strength and bravery, a man who perhaps actually accomplished a swimming-feat similar, except for the epic elaboration, to that mentioned in the poem in connection with Hygelac's defeat. It would have been easy to transfer to such a man the exploits properly belonging to Bear's Son. *Beowulf* is perhaps the name actually borne by this historical character. The transformation of the fairy-tale into the more elaborate heroic story with the champion *Beowulf* as its central figure probably took place in Scandinavian territory. The Scandinavian origin of the Grendel saga is particularly strengthened by the identity of the *Beowulf* and *Bjarki* stories (that is, if Panzer's hypotheses are to be accepted). One or perhaps more than one Danish poem on *Beowulf* came to England, and there, not through mere translation, but by free reworking, which nevertheless left the main outlines of the story unchanged, the epic came into existence. The chapter closes with a general attack on the well-known theory that the protagonist was earlier the "divine hero" *Beowa*,—an hypothesis closely connected with the idea that the substratum of the story lies in mythical conceptions. Both of these strongholds of the earlier criticism are vigorously assaulted in Panzer's book. But he is hardly so much of a pioneer in calling attention to the real weakness of these doctrines as his statements sometimes imply.³ From the time of the appearance of Müllenhoff's revised *Untersuchungen* in 1889,

³ Compare, for example, Panzer's words, p. 395, "Denn darin ist die bisherige Forschung einig, dass nicht *Beowulf*, sondern der anglische Stammeshero *Beaw(a)* oder *Beow(a)* der eigentliche und ursprüngliche Träger der Sage war, die erst nachträglich von ihm auf den Gauten *Beowulf* übertragen wurde," and Sarrazin's query (*Englische Studien* xvi, 72) "Warum und wozu die künstliche und unwahrscheinliche hypothese eines urangelsächsischen *Beowamythus?*", as well as his accompanying argument.

down to the present day, there has been a certain amount of critical dissent, although it is perfectly true that it has made little headway against the commonly accepted view. In June, 1909, the present writer published an extended criticism of the *Beowa*-hypothesis in particular and of the mythical theory in general.⁴ The time has surely come when those who write about the sources of *Beowulf* should consider whether they will blindly subscribe to the precepts of the school of Müllenhoff, which recent research in other fields than philology has done so much to discredit, or whether they will make up their minds independently, on the basis of the evidence, giving due attention to the arguments of the opposition. It is getting to be increasingly difficult to effect a compromise between these old dogmas and the results of modern research, as Brandl's contribution to the revised edition of Paul's *Grundriss* sufficiently shows. Such a study as Panzer's, coming not from the outside world, but from the heart of Germany itself, may well give the inheritors of the Müllenhoffian tradition food for thought.

There will be, no doubt, a considerable amount of unfavorable comment upon the way in which the main thesis of the book is worked out. No two men would classify and analyze in just the same way the large body of *märchen* which in some form or other present analogies to *Beowulf*. But that a very real, important, and intimate connection does exist between this material and the epic few will be so hardy as to deny. The great difficulty comes in establishing the precise connection between the two, in deciding how far it is safe to let ingenuity carry us. In the closing paragraph of his book Dr. Panzer promises a second volume showing the dependence of the Sigurd-story upon the tale of Bear's-Son. The attempt has already been made to show a common origin for the stories of Sigurd and of *Beowulf*,⁵ as well as for other narratives not generally associated with them. But there is danger in hatching too much medieval literature of a single egg,

⁴ *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, loc. cit.

⁵ Sarrazin, *Beowulf-Studien*, Berlin, 1888, p. 53.

and it is to be hoped that Dr. Panzer will exercise a pretty rigid control in deriving other legends from his group of *märchen*. Too much flexibility in the application of his formula will result in hopeless confusion. This was felt to be one of the chief faults with the author's earlier studies in the *Gudrun*.⁶ In the present volume he has stretched his *märchen* a little, to say the least, to make it fit the Bjarki-story, although in general there is little suggestion of special pleading. Further and possibly less judicious applications of the theory might alienate belief from his relatively cautious operations with *Beowulf*.

On the whole, this may stand, not only as one of the most ambitious books on *Beowulf* that have appeared for many years, but also as one of the most important. Disregarding details, and looking at the work as a whole, one can only speak with hearty appreciation of its scholarship, and of the care and labor which have gone to its making.

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.
Columbia University.

La Chastelaine de Vergi. Poème du XIII^e siècle.
Edité par GASTON RAYNAUD. Paris, Champion, 1910. 12mo., viii + 31 pp.

François Villon. Œuvres. Editées par un ancien archiviste. Avec un index des noms propres. Paris, Champion, 1911. 12mo., xvi + 123 pp.

These two attractive volumes are the first of a new series of medieval texts recently started under the general editorship of Professor Mario Roques. The aim is not primarily to edit unpublished texts (although this may occasionally be the case) but to bring within the easy reach of students all the truly essential works of French and Provençal literature of the Middle Ages. This seems to cover more ground than the general title of the collection, *Les Classiques français du moyen âge*, would lead us to expect; but we are asked to take the words "classiques" in a wide sense. It is not necessary that these editions should be provided

with full introductions and complete glossaries; but they must offer a thoroughly reliable text, sufficient references for further study, they must be of very moderate price, and finally they have to appear in close enough succession to provide in a few years a rather complete working library of medieval texts. Such is the program set forth by Prof. Roques, and we have no doubt that it will appeal to every student of medieval French literature. Let us state at once that the *Chastelaine de Vergi* costs eighty centimes and Villon, two francs, and that further the following texts have appeared or are due to appear in 1912: *Courtois d'Arras* (Faral), *La Vie de Saint Alexis* (reprint, Gaston Paris), Philippe de Novare, *Mémoires* (Kohler), *Le Garçon et l'Aveugle* (Roques), Colin Muset, *Chansons* (Bédier), Adam de la Halle, *Le jeu de la Feuillée* (Langlois), Peire Vidal, *Œuvres* (Anglade), *Le Coronement Looïs* (Langlois), *Chansons satiriques et bachiques* (Jeanroy), *Aspremont* (Brandin), *Aucassin et Nicolette* (Roques), Bérout, *Le Roman de Tristan* (Muret).

M. Gaston Raynaud, who in 1892 had printed the *Chastelaine de Vergi* in *Romania*, XXI, pp. 165-193, gives us a new edition of this charming thirteenth-century romance. It is not a mere reprint, but the text of 1892 has been revised and improved. The edition is based on ms. BN fr. 837 occasionally corrected with the help of eight other mss. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, including one which was unknown to M. Raynaud in 1892. The rejected variants of C., as well as the most interesting variants of the other mss., are given in the Introduction. The author of the *Chastelaine* writes in a clear, graceful, flowing style, the editor has taken great care with the punctuation: the result is that one reads this poem with more ease and enjoyment than almost any other of the same century. The only passage that seems a little intricate is contained in lines 815-819: the construction is not clear and probably one of the lines calls for correction.—*par Amors*, line 262, ought to be *par amors*.—According to the general scheme of the series the glossary gives only the words that are not of common occurrence; perhaps *faire regret* ought to have been added: in line 735 it seems to mean *faire honte*.—In *Romania* M. Raynaud had proposed to identify the characters of

⁶ Cf. review by Symons, *Literaturblatt* XXIII, 321.

the romance with certain real people of the thirteenth century: scholars as a rule have shown little sympathy with this attempt, and I note that M. Raynaud is now half inclined to give it up himself. At least he writes: "ce roman dont l'héroïne a *peut-être* réellement vécu à la cour de Hugues IV, duc de Bourgogne . . ." It would seem as if we had to look for the sources of our poem elsewhere than in contemporary life. Why not in literary tradition? There is a curious similarity between the subject matter of the *Chastelaine* and the plot on which are based three well known Breton "lais": *Lanval*, *Guingamor* and *Graelent*; only there is no supernatural element in the thirteenth century romance and the end is a tragic one. This similarity was pointed out years ago by Ahlström, in his *Studier i den fornfranska lais-litteraturen*, Upsala, 1892, pp. 69-71, and I do not know whether his suggestion has been taken up and discussed by any one: it certainly deserves consideration.

All students of Villon will be under great obligation to the "ancien archiviste" who is responsible for the second volume of the series. Good as were some of the preceding editions, this last one is a distinct improvement on any that has yet appeared.—In the Introduction the editor briefly relates the facts of Villon's life, says a few words concerning the four fifteenth century MSS. and the 1489 print on which any edition must necessarily be based, gives a critical list of the chief publications on Villon, and finally indicates the principles according to which he prints his own edition. He places first *Les Lais* (1456), then *Le Testament* (1461 or 1462) and finally, in chronological order, the *Poésies diverses* (about 1457-1464) which comprise 16 pieces, mostly ballades, chief among which is the famous *Epitaphe* which the poet wrote when he expected to be hanged. He definitely rejects the *Ballade des pauvres housseurs* printed by Longnon as one of three poems of doubtful authenticity. The second was *Le dit de la naissance Marie d'Orleans*, which in the new edition is attributed to Villon and contrary to former practice is reprinted in conformity with the MS., that is with the *Double ballade* inserted in the middle of it. This order is surely the right one, for only so does the signature *Vostre povre escolier François* come where it should, that is, in the last line. The third doubtful piece, *Ballade contre les mesdisans de la France*, appears now also among Villon's genuine poems. Nobody will find fault with the editor for having decided to omit altogether the *Ballades de jargon*.

As a basis for his text, the editor took, of course, the Longnon edition of 1892, supplemented, quite naturally too, by the article of *Romania*, where G. Paris proposed many correc-

tions which have been universally accepted. But he did not rest there. A number of corrections made by G. Paris had been but a return to the tradition of the MSS., and our editor, realizing that many a good reading might be yet brought out of the mass of unused variants, submitted all the MSS. to a new and careful study. This has enabled him to improve the accepted text in many places. To quote one example: lines 1664-5 of *Testament* read in the Longnon and the Schneegans editions:

Une leçon de mon escolle
Leur *lairay*, qui ne dure guere.

A F I have *liray* instead of *lairay*: and that they are right is shown by lines 1667 and 1684. Our editor introduced this excellent reading into his text. Other examples of corrections are to be found in L. 174, T. 424, 472, 936, 960, 1185, 1220, 1573, 1612, etc. Some of these changes are obviously right, some a little more doubtful: I question whether it was expedient to introduce *o* (= avec) in nine places where *all* the sources agree in reading *ou* or *et*; one would like to know if the reading *Helaine o luy*, T 1499 (the only line in Longnon that has *o*) is absolutely reliable. But, on the whole, there is no doubt but that Villon's text has gained much through this thorough revision. It should be noted that in some places the editor rightly retained a reading of Longnon to which G. Paris had taken exception (see the very interesting note on T, line 1).

The editor has shown the most scrupulous care in the punctuation; indeed there is hardly any page that does not show abundant proof of the thoroughness with which he has carried out this part of his task. (As a single instance, see T, verse lvi.—There should be a comma after L 172, T 1130 and possibly an interrogation mark after T 949.) As a result it is no exaggeration to say that, thanks to this new editor, it has become very much easier to read Villon than it ever was before. Nevertheless, many difficulties are yet awaiting their solution.

The text of the Works is followed by a list of the most significant variants. Along with them are inserted a few references to Latin or French authors alluded to by Villon. Some, I think, had not been given before (see note to T, lines 601-3).—Then come an Index of proper names and a Glossary of difficult words. I note that many references in the Glossary are inaccurate. The Index is claimed to be absolutely complete; it even contains names that appear only in the Variants, and it gives all passages in which the names are used. To MARCHANT (Perrenet) should be added T 764, to MARCHANT (Ythier) T 1024. For RAGUIER (Jacques) T 1058-59 read 1038-39, for Robert T 570 read 750. The explanations

are not as full as those given in Longnon's Index, which was such a novel and useful feature of the 1892 edition, but they contain all that is necessary to a better understanding of Villon's allusions. The Index of the present edition has, of course, profited by the results of later criticism or of the editor's own investigation; see DESPERANCE, GONTHIER, HAREMBURGIS, MARTHE, TRUMEL-LIERES, VICTOR (Saint), etc.

LUCIEN FOULET.

University of California.

CORRESPONDENCE.

King Lear AND *A Yorkshire Tragedy*

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—There is a parallel between an incident in the pseudo-Shakespearean *Yorkshire Tragedy* and another near the close of the third act of *King Lear* which may possibly be of significance in connection with the disputed question of the date of the latter play. In each case a faithful servant attempts to prevent his master from committing an atrocious crime, and in each case, after a physical struggle on the stage, the servant is overcome.

In *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, there enters, as the husband is stabbing his wife, "a lusty servant," and the following dialogue ensues:—

- "Ser. Oh Sir, what deeds are these?
 Hus. Base slaue, my vassail:
 Comst thou between my fury to question me?
 Ser. Were you the Deuil, I would hold you, sir.
 Hus. Hould me? presumption! Ile vndoe thee
 for't.
 Ser. Sbloud, you haue vndone vs all, sir.
 Hus. Tug at thy master!
 Ser. Tug at a Monster.
 Hus. Haue I no power? shall my slaue fetter me?
 Ser. Nay, then, the Deuil wrastles, I am throwne.
 Hus. Oh, villane, now Ile tug thee, now Ile teare
 thee," etc.
 (Sc. v. ll. 36 ff. *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 258.)

All readers will remember the similar episode in *King Lear* where Cornwall's first servant vainly interposes at the blinding of Gloster:

- "1. Serv. Hold your hand, my Lord!
 I have served you ever since I was a
 child;
 But better service have I never done you
 Than now to bid you hold.
 Regan. How now, you dog!
 1. Serv. If you did wear a beard upon your chin,
 I'd shake it on this quarrel. What do
 you mean?

- Corn. My villain! (*They draw and fight.*)
 1. Serv. Nay, then, come on, and take the chance
 of anger.
 Regan. Give me thy sword. A peasant stand
 up thus?
 (*Takes a sword, and runs at him behind.*)
 1. Serv. Oh, I am slain," etc.
 (III, vii, ll. 72 ff.)

There is no question here of verbal identity, nor is there any striking likeness in the working out of the details. No sane critic would dream of attributing the lines quoted from *A Yorkshire Tragedy* to the pen of Shakespeare. Yet the general resemblance between the two passages is sufficiently clear, and since no mention of the servant occurs in Shakespeare's source for this part of *Lear* (Sidney's *Arcadia*), it is quite possible that the idea was suggested to the poet by the other play, where the unknown author is apparently merely staging an actual incident of the Yorkshire murders.

A Yorkshire Tragedy can be pretty exactly dated. The crimes upon which the play is based occurred April 23, 1605, and Calverley, the criminal, was executed on the fifth of the following August. During this interval at least two prose accounts of the atrocities were licensed in London. The uncertainty in which the play leaves us concerning Calverley's precise fate—an uncertainty quite at variance with the sensational completeness usual in the murder plays of the time—gives reason for the assumption that *A Yorkshire Tragedy* was written before the details of Calverley's trial and execution had yet reached London.

That Shakespeare was well acquainted with *A Yorkshire Tragedy* is perfectly certain, apart from the possibility that he may have had a scant share in its composition, from the fact that it was acted by his company. If, therefore, any importance can be attached to the parallel I have pointed out, it will be reasonable to conclude that Shakespeare took over a hint for a scene of the unfinished *Lear*, during the early summer of 1605, from the ephemeral piece which his company were then performing and which certain internal and external evidence suggests that it was Shakespeare's duty to oversee. This would support the theories of those critics who regard the year 1604 as too early for *Lear* and who prefer to assign the completion and staging of the play to the latter half of 1605 or to 1606.

C. F. TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

A FURTHER PARALLEL TO THE "CORONES TWO"
OF THE *Second Nun's Tale*

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—It is of course unnecessary to add anything to strengthen Professor Lowes' explanation (in the *Pub. M. L. A.* for June) of the significance of the "corones two" given to Cecilia and to Valerian. But the following lines from Lydgate's poem, usually called, from its refrain, *As a Midsummer Rose*, furnish a parallel completer in some ways and closer in time to Chaucer's "garland wrought of rose and lillie" than do Professor Lowes' references to Jacobus de Voragine. Lydgate has just referred to the golden crowns "made in the heavenly stage," of the ten thousand martyrs of the Theban legion at "Rodomus ryver." He goes back then, with true Lydgatian aberrancy, to the earthly crowns of martyrs:

- 109 "Laurear of martirs, foundid on holynes,
White was maade reede there triumphs to
disclose;
The white lillie was pere chaast elennes,
Theire bloody sufferance was no somer rose!
- It was the rose of the bloody felde,
Rose of Iherico that grue in Bedlem,
The fyve rosis portraid in the shelde,
Splaid in þe baner at Iherusalem."

H. N. MACCRACKEN.

New Haven.

Ave IN RHYME IN THIBAUT AND IN DANTE

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In the *Divine Comedy* Dante thrice uses the word *Ave* in rhyme:—

- Giurato si saria ch' ei dicesse: *Ave*,
Purg. x. 40.
- Così parlammi, e poi cominciò: *Ave*,
Maria, cantando; e cantando vanio,
Par. iii. 121-122.
- Dissemi: Da quel dì che fu detto *Ave*,
Par. xvi. 34.

Ave in rhyme, with *Maria* standing as the first word of the next line, appears also in the *chanson* of Thibaut de Champagne, *Dou très dous nom à la Vierge Marie*,¹ in the close of the poem, as follows:

¹ *Chansons de Thibault IV* (ed. P. Tarbé), Reims, 1851, pp. 121-122.

Or li prions merci per sa bonté:
Au dous salus, qui se comence *Ave*
Maria, Diex nous gart de meschéance!

Dante was familiar with the poetry of Thibaut.² Very possibly acquaintance with this passage suggested the *Ave | Maria* of *Par.* iii. 121-122,—perhaps also the use of *Ave* in rhyme in the other two instances.

ERNEST H. WILKINS.

Harvard University.

LITERARY PARALLELS

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Apropos of Spenser and Milton in the eighteenth century, I note two interesting borrowings, one in Collins's *Ode to Evening*, and one in Richardson's *Pamela*. Everyone who reads the former recognizes in the last two verses of the stanza

"Now air is hushed, save where the weak-eyed bat
With short, shrill shriek flits by on leathern wing;
Or where the beetle winds
His small but sullen horn."

an echo of *Lycidas*. I do not remember that any one has called attention to the parallel between the second verse and a line in the *Faerie Queene*. In Book I, v, 33, we read:

"[They] come to fiery flood of Phlegeton,
Whereas the damned ghosts in torments fry,
And with sharp shrilling shrieks, doe bootlesse cry,
Cursing high Jove, the which them thither sent."

An echo of *Comus*, unimportant but not devoid of interest, occurs in *Pamela*, letter xxxii: "About eight at night we entered the courtyard of this handsome, large, old, and lonely mansion, that looks made for solitude and mischief, as I thought, by its appearance, with all its brown nodding horrors of lofty elms and pines about it." The passage is unusual, for *Pamela* does not, as a rule, waste her ink in describing the outdoor world. Is it impossible that Richardson, as he wrote, recalled Milton's lines,

"Their way
Lies through the perplexed paths of this drear wood,
The nodding horror of whose shady brows
Threats the forlorn and wandering passenger."
(*Comus*, 36 f.)

F. B. SNYDER.

Northwestern University.

² *De vulgari eloquentia*, i. 9; ii. 5 and 6.

BRIEF MENTION

Professor Uno Lindelöf, of Helsingfors, is an English scholar of acknowledged merit, and any history of the language that he might write would be expected to take high rank. His *Grunddragen* has now been translated into English, and the title of the book, *Elements of the History of the English Language* (University of Washington Publications in English, vol. 1), joined with the name of so eminent a scholar will attract attention. It is to be regretted that reasonable expectations will encounter a considerable degree of disappointment. The treatise, of 128 pages, consists of (1) chapters on English as an Indo-European language; (2) Old-English (a rather complete restatement of the grammar of sounds and inflection); (3) the influence of foreign languages (some of the most instructive paragraphs are to be found here); and (4) the development of English since the year 1100 (the complex material of this portion of the subject has not been handled with particular success). It is useful and altogether commendable to treat these subjects in an elementary textbook, but the difficulty of doing this as it should be done has perhaps not been sufficiently considered by Professor Lindelöf. At all events, Professor Münsterberg has supplied a pertinent expression: "The great scholar, who has tried his power in scores of special investigations, may try, at the height of his work, to connect his thoughts about the whole field into one system, and to translate it into the simple terms of a book for beginners. That is the sort of textbook which helps the world: nothing is more difficult and more noble; every line written therein stands for pages" (*Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1906, p. 624). Professor Lindelöf has not succeeded in constructing a uniformly adequate exposition of his subject. His knowledge is full and his purpose is good, but he has not always thought out his facts with reference to those "simple terms" that "help the world" of inexpert readers. At times he indulges in a sort of journalistic superficiality, which contrasts strangely with statements that are masterfully clear and fittingly complete. A strongly sustained view of what the elements of a subject are should have saved the author from being in some cases elementary in the weakest sense of that word, and in other cases so technical as to baffle the comprehension of any reader that is not to some extent a specialist. *Elements* do not mean half-truths, but whole truths reduced to simple terms. Incompleteness that is detrimental to the satisfactory use of the book will be discovered, for example, in the author's references to the 'wave-theory' (pp. 25, 30, etc.); and to Grimm's Law; and in his disappointing way of

fulfilling a promise concerning Verner's Law (pp. 50, 57). Such unexplained declarations as "The literary monuments of the transitional period are especially interesting" must evoke the rational query, Why? And a structural defect is conspicuously exposed by an unwelcome but often repeated "space forbids" or "of this we cannot speak here." Undeniably, in such a sketch Professor Lindelöf could not fail to contribute many valuable observations; and it is pleasant to find that (contrary to strict propriety, perhaps) his scholarly enthusiasm is occasionally warmed even into sentiment; but, judged most generously, the book cannot be said to supply a definite want. The translator, Dr. Robert M. Garrett, should have bestowed more pains upon his task. His paragraphs suggest the process of dependent transference rather than that of idiomatic translation. There are easily avoided lapses into professional cant: "stuff-words" and "form-words" (p. 65) are ugly words; and such a sentence as, "Here English stands in sharp contrast to OHG., whose perhaps most peculiar characteristic is" etc. (p. 46), represents a variety of grammatical accuracy that cannot make amends for an offence against the translator's good taste. Slight corrections like the following would give relief at a large number of places: "We take as our basis, as do [as is done in] philological works in general, a hypothetical West Germanic sound-stage, found [system of sounds, deduced, or inferred] by comparison" etc. (p. 42, note).

Albricias, señores, que vos trayo buen mandado! The appearance of the two remaining volumes of R. Menéndez Pidal's *Cantar de Mio Cid*¹ marks the completion of one of the most important scientific undertakings in the field of Spanish literature. In anticipation of a detailed review of the work it seems desirable to mention at least the scope of so monumental a work. Volume I (1908) contained the *Gramática*. Volume II, which is devoted to the *Vocabulario*, is a treatise of nearly five hundred pages, exhaustive as to words and word-forms, comparative in relation to medieval Spanish, and, at times, even encyclopedic in character. The volume contains not only numerous illustrations bearing on the arms, accoutrements, etc., but also two plates; namely, a genealogy of the Vanigómez family and a map of Spain at the end of the eleventh century, designed especially to illustrate history and geography in their relation to the *Cantar de Mio Cid*. Volume III contains both an "edición paleográfica" and an "edición crítica" of the poem.

¹ *Cantar de Mio Cid*. Texto, Gramática, y Vocabulario. Vols. II and III. Madrid: Bailly-Baillière, 1911. 8vo., pp. 421-904 and 905-1182.